

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 217

JC 798 161

TITLE Excellence and the Open Door: An Essential Partnership. A Report of the Commission to Study the Mission, Financing, and Governance of the County Colleges, State of New Jersey. Volume One.

INSTITUTION New Jersey State Board of Higher Education, Trenton.

PUB DATE Mar 79

NOTE 72p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Access to Education; Articulation (Program); *College Role; Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational Objectives; *Financial Support; *Governance; Governing Boards; *Junior Colleges; Open Enrollment; School District Autonomy; Staff Improvement; State Aid; State School District Relationship; *Statewide Planning; Trustees

IDENTIFIERS *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study of the county colleges in New Jersey were to: (1) examine their mission, governance, and financing; (2) determine whether philosophies and operating mechanisms of a period of expansion would provide sufficient support and direction for the future; and (3) make recommendations based upon the study. In addition to supporting the comprehensive mission of the colleges, the Commission also supported their open access policy. The development and expansion of occupational programs were seen to be of major importance, as was the commitment of resources to professional development for faculty, administrators, and staff. As the community-based nature of the colleges contributes to their flexibility, the Commission opposed drastic change in their current local management and governance model; however, criteria were recommended in relation to enhancing effectiveness in governance. These included the establishment of a balance of powers, diversity of individual trustees, and independence from political interference. Toward these ends, the Commission recommended the appointment of two of the nine trustees on each board by the State, increased community representation, and continued separation of college governance from the county structure. The recommended funding mechanism shifted from being enrollment-driven to recognizing fixed cost, and included greater state support. (Author/MB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Excellence and the Open Door: An Essential Partnership

A Report of the Commission
to Study the Mission,
Financing, and Governance
of the County Colleges
State of New Jersey

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

New Jersey Board of
Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



A Commission Appointed by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education

Excellence and the Open Door: An Essential Partnership

A Report of the Commission
to Study the Mission,
Financing, and Governance
of the County Colleges
State of New Jersey

March 1979 • Volume One



A Commission Appointed by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume One: Report of the Commission

Foreword	5
Executive Summary	7
Listing of Recommendations	9
Excellence and the Open Door: An Essential Partnership	13
Introduction	13
Recommendations Related to Mission (1-27)	13
Background	13
Open Access	14
Educational Standards	16
Comprehensive Mission	17
Articulation	17
The Key Functions of Comprehensive Community Colleges	19
Recommendations Related to Governance (28-44)	29
Background	29
Principles of Governance	29
Composition and Appointment of Community College Boards of Trustees	30
The Counties	36
Statutory/Regulatory Review	37
Council of County Colleges	38
Recommendations Related to Financing (45-56)	38
Background	38
Distribution of State Support for Community Colleges	39
Level of State Support for Community Colleges	44
The Financial Implications of Open Access	47
Support for Plant Renewal and Replacement	49
Financial Aid to Part-time Students	49
The Basis for State Support and Distribution	50
Implementation	51
Public Testimony	52
Introduction	52
Testimony Concerning the Mission of the Community Colleges	52
Testimony Concerning the Governance of the Community Colleges	63
Testimony Concerning the Financing of the Community Colleges	66
Individuals Presenting Statements to the Commission	70

Volume Two: Appendices to the Report of the Commission

- A. Charge to the Commission and Related Board of Higher Education Resolutions
- B. Composition of the Trustee Boards of the New Jersey Community Colleges:
Questionnaire Results
- C. New Jersey County Colleges and Local Government
- D. Role of the New Jersey Community College Trustees: Questionnaire Results
- E. Information Summary: Adult Education/ Community Education
- F. Information Summary: A Review of the Literature on Financing Community Colleges
- G. Information Summary: Boards of Trustees
- H. Information Summary: Characteristics of the New Jersey Community Colleges
- I. Information Summary: Occupational Education
- J. Information Summary: Open Access
- K. Information Summary: Remediation

Note: Volume Two is a companion publication to the Report of the Commission to Study the Mission, Financing, and Governance of the County Colleges.

FOREWORD

The framework for a system of county community colleges in the State of New Jersey was established by the legislature in 1962 and the first colleges opened their doors in the fall of 1966. During the next twelve years the system grew rapidly. The community colleges have entered their second decade of existence within a dramatically different educational and economic environment characterized by stable or declining enrollments and financial stringency. Recognizing the many problems and difficult decisions educators and administrators will be facing in the 1980s, the Board of Higher Education decided to launch a comprehensive study of the community college system.

On January 27, 1978, the Board of Higher Education established the Commission to Study the Mission, Financing, and Governance of the County Colleges. Chancellor T. Edward Hollander was asked to solicit nominations of individuals to serve on the Commission, and recommend a list of names to the Executive Committee of the Board.

On March 17, 1978, the Board passed resolutions appointing individuals to the Commission; setting forth its charge; and establishing January 31, 1979, as the submission date for its final report. Individuals appointed to the Commission included eight public members; two members of Boards of Chosen Freeholders; two community college presidents; two board of trustee members of the Council of County Colleges; two community college faculty members; two community college alumni; the Governor's designee; and the Director of the Office of Community College Programs, Department of Higher Education (*ex officio*). The Commission was charged with recommending to the Board, through the Chancellor, a proposed statement of the mission of the community college sector; a proposal for alternative funding approaches; and a proposal for improved relationships between and among the colleges, the counties, and the State relative to the governance of the county colleges.

The Department of Higher Education allocated \$52,300 to fund the study. In addition, Chancellor Hollander obtained a grant from the Ford Foundation to support research into the relationship between state funding mechanisms for aid to community colleges and the pattern of services delivered by community colleges. Dr. Bryan K. Blanchard was chosen Study Director, coordinating staff data collection and analysis and directing all staff support. Other staff members included: Dr. Edward L. Delaney, Researcher; Mr. Dennis R. Crimer, Research Assistant; Dr. Maryann Mercer, part-time consultant; and Ms. Mary Bennett and Ms. Barbara Bruschi, administrative and secretarial support.

The Commission held its organizational meeting on April 4, 1978. Task groups were established to focus on the three major components of Mission, Financing, and Governance, and were chaired by Dr. E. Alden Dunham, Mr. E. Donald Shapiro, and Mr. Gustav Henningburg, respectively. Mr. Shapiro resigned from his position as Chairman of the Financing Task Group in June of 1978, and from the Commission in January 1979; he was replaced as Chairman of the Financing Task Group by Mr. James Litvack, who was formally appointed to the Commission on September 15, 1978.

On May 17, 1978, a letter explaining the purpose of the Commission and announcing a first public meeting was sent to a mailing list (numbering approximately 750) comprised of members of the education and higher education communities; county and state government officials; members of several state level advisory councils; and political party leaders.

The Commission's preliminary public meeting was held at Middlesex County College on June 5, 1978, and six additional hearings were scheduled and held at county colleges throughout the state during August and September (see listing below). Letters were sent to all individuals on the mailing list encouraging their participation. Eighty individuals presented formal statements at the public meetings, and many other interested persons attended to observe the proceedings. A summary of the testimony presented and a listing of participants conclude volume one of this report.

The Bureau of Government Research at Rutgers was retained to analyze the relationship between trustees and county freeholders, and other political leaders. The Commission's staff reviewed the literature on community colleges, conducted research on the operation of county colleges in New Jersey, and collected a considerable amount of collateral data. Information summaries were generated on many aspects of community college mission, factors affecting the financing of the colleges, and issues involved in governance. The research and survey data comprise the appendices of the report, and are presented in volume two.

Many areas of concern pertinent to the future development of the community college system in New Jersey emerged from the public hearings conducted by the Commission. This testimony, together with the information collected by the staff, provided the context for the Commission's deliberations. Many of the topics addressed were quite complex and controversial, and the Commission strongly encouraged a full debate of the issues. Frequent meetings of the three task groups and the Commission as a whole provided ample opportunity for discussion of numerous points of view.

The Commission wishes to express appreciation to the staff for their invaluable assistance. Their ability to focus and refine a considerable body of complex information and to meet the needs of a large and diverse Commission was critical to the formulation of the recommendations and issues which follow. We would also like to offer our gratitude to Educational Testing Service (ETS) for both their professional support and the accommodations provided during the numerous meetings of the Commission. In particular we would like to recognize the substantial contributions of Ms. Audre A. Griffiths and Dr. Douglas W. Rhodes of ETS, who were central to the framing and development of the Commission's report.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Mrs. Avon Arnold	Mr. Joseph Klegman	Mr. Edward H. Salmon
Mrs. Jean Byrne	Ms. Josephine M. Lamela	Dr. Donald H. Smith
Mrs. Jane G. Clayton	Dr. Jerome Lieberman	Mr. Vincent Strumolo, Jr.
Mr. Gabriel E. Danch	Mr. James M. Litvack	Mr. Robert H. Taylor
Dr. E. Alden Dunham	Dr. Sherman H. Masten	Ms. Elaine Thompson
Ms. Arlene Gardner	Mrs. Sonia Rosado	Dr. E. Belvin Williams
Mr. Gustav Heningburg	Dr. Deena Sadat (observer)	Dr. Edward D. Goldberg (<i>ex officio</i>)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. Edward D. Goldberg
 Mr. Joseph Klegman
 Mrs. Sonia Rosado
 Mr. Robert H. Taylor, Chairman
 Dr. E. Belvin Williams, Vice Chairman

PUBLIC MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION

June 5, 1978	Middlesex County College-Edison
August 8, 1978	Passaic County Community College-Paterson
August 9, 1978	Atlantic Community College-Mays Landing
August 16, 1978	Union College-Cranford
August 29, 1978	County College of Morris-Randolph
September 6, 1978	Gloucester County College-Deptford
September 19, 1978	Thompson Park-Lincroft

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present system of public two-year colleges represents a significant contribution to the advancement of educational opportunity in the state of New Jersey. In just over a decade 17 entities delivering community college services have been established, and now serve approximately 98,500 students—a total almost equal to the combined enrollments of Rutgers and the state colleges. The Commission's study of the county colleges focused upon their mission, governance, and financing, and sought to determine whether the philosophies and operating mechanisms that had served the system during its period of rapid expansion would provide sufficient support and direction in the future.

After concluding its study, the Commission endorses the comprehensive mission of the community colleges (as articulated in the 1974 Master Plan for Higher Education in New Jersey) and supports their continued provision of academic programs equivalent to the first two years of the baccalaureate; postsecondary occupational programs of shorter duration than baccalaureate programs; general interest education programs; and community service programs. The Commission also supports the open door (open access) admission policy of the community colleges and urges increased efforts to ensure that this policy is a viable one. These include more comprehensive remedial programs; increased emphasis on student counseling services; entrance standards for degree programs; more extensive and systematic institutional research/evaluation; and improved access through the establishment of "satellite" campuses, improved public transportation, and relaxation of the county boundary attendance rules.

The Commission considers the development and expansion of occupational programs to be of major importance. In view of current and anticipated economic stringencies, improved efficiency through regionalized program offerings and increased sharing and coordination of resources among various deliverers of postsecondary education is also a significant need.

Further, in recognition of the uniqueness of the county colleges and the communities and populations they serve, the Commission urges the commitment of resources to professional development for faculty, administrators, and staff; continued support for the growth of the adult education and community services functions of the colleges; and the maintenance of clear distinctions between the institutions and agencies offering postsecondary educational services.

The governance of New Jersey's community colleges is critical to the continued growth of this sector of higher education. The community-based nature of these institutions has contributed to their flexibility and individuality, and the Commission sees no need for drastic change in the local management and control model currently in existence.

In considering how the effectiveness of the present system could be enhanced, the Commission identified the following criteria related to effective governance: establishment of a balance of power; diversity of individual trustees; and independence from political interference.

In applying these principles of effective governance to the community college sector, the Commission has recommended the appointment of two of the nine trustees on each board by the State; increased representation of the diversity of the community, the college, and the student body in the attributes possessed by trustee boards; the establishment of independent, county-based trustee nominating committees; efforts to assure the independence of the trustee boards from political and institutional influence; and the continued separation of the governance of the community colleges from the county governmental structure.

The major thrust of the finance recommendations concerns the nature of the distribution of support to New Jersey community colleges. Stable and declining enrollments call for a major shift in the underlying rationale of the funding mechanism from one which is almost entirely enrollment driven to one which recognizes the fixed nature of many of the costs of operating a college and relates to the differing costs of the educational programs. Also addressed in the proposed funding mechanism is an equitable and uniform process for relating annual increases in state aid

to the community college sector to those of other sectors of higher education. Additionally the Commission believes that the viability of open access requires the maintenance of low tuition levels, financial aid to part-time students, and fair and effective chargeback arrangements between counties.

Finally, the Commission believes that the overall level of state support is not consonant with the original partnership set forth in the 1966 community college funding legislation. For the State to continue to benefit from the educational services that the community college system delivers, greater support of this sector is essential.

While the Commission does not see the need for major changes in the mission, governance, and financing of the county colleges, the integrated set of recommendations offered in the full report is believed to be essential to assure their strength and continuing flexibility in the face of social change.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE MISSION, FINANCING, AND GOVERNANCE OF THE COUNTY COLLEGES

MISSION

1. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE THE OPEN DOOR TO HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE ENTIRE POPULATION OF NEW JERSEY.
2. TUITION AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD REMAIN LOW SO THAT IT DOES NOT BECOME A BARRIER TO ATTENDANCE.
3. COUNTY BOUNDARIES SHOULD NOT SERVE AS BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ATTENDANCE.
4. COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES SHOULD BE MADE MORE AVAILABLE THROUGH SATELLITE CAMPUSES AND BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.
5. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD ESTABLISH ENTRANCE AND PROGRESS STANDARDS FOR DEGREE PROGRAMS TO ENSURE THE HIGH QUALITY OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS.
6. THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD DEVELOP A DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM TO ENSURE A CORE OF INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING.
7. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD RETAIN THEIR COMPREHENSIVE MISSION.
8. IN KEEPING WITH THEIR COMPREHENSIVE MISSION, THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD FOCUS ON: ACADEMIC TRANSFER PROGRAMS, CAREER OR OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS, GENERAL EDUCATION, REMEDIATION AND BASIC SKILLS, ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, CAREER COUNSELING PROGRAMS, PUBLIC/COMMUNITY SERVICE, AND TEACHING RATHER THAN RESEARCH.
9. RUTGERS AND THE STATE COLLEGES SHOULD OFFER ONLY BONA FIDE FOUR-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL/TECHNICAL PROGRAMS.
10. RUTGERS AND THE STATE COLLEGES SHOULD SEEK TO ATTRACT THE SUBSTANTIAL PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO PURSUE HIGHER EDUCATION OUTSIDE THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY.
11. RUTGERS AND THE STATE COLLEGES SHOULD LIMIT THEIR EXTENSION PROGRAMS TO THOSE LOWER DIVISION AND NON-CREDIT COURSES NOT AVAILABLE THROUGH THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND EXPAND THEIR UPPER DIVISION AND GRADUATE LEVEL OFFERINGS.
12. FORMAL INTER-INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COUNCILS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN URBAN AREAS WHERE COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE LOCATED IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO OTHER PUBLICLY SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.
13. FULL-FAITH-AND-CREDIT AGREEMENTS SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY, AND TO APPLY TO STUDENTS IN OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS.
14. THE COMMISSION ENDORSES THE LONG-STANDING ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO OFFER THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM.
15. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD OFFER A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES TO PROVIDE BASIC ACADEMIC, SOCIAL AND/OR BEHAVIORAL SKILLS TO INDIVIDUALS NEEDING REMEDIATION AND PROVIDE SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT TO ENSURE THEIR IDENTIFICATION AND PROPER PLACEMENT WITHIN THE PROGRAM.

16. THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF CREDIT AND NON-CREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IS A HIGH PRIORITY; IMMEDIATE ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THIS ISSUE.
17. THE AREA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOLS SHOULD NOT DEVELOP NEW POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS AND EXISTING PROGRAMS SHOULD BE COORDINATED WITH COMMUNITY COLLEGE OFFERINGS.
18. A SINGLE STATEWIDE BODY SHOULD BE VESTED WITH THE AUTHORITY TO COORDINATE THE DELIVERY OF MANPOWER TRAINING SERVICES IN NEW JERSEY AND TO ALLOCATE FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS FOR OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING.
19. IN THEIR COUNTY FISCAL REVIEW ROLE THE FREEHOLDERS SHOULD PREVENT DUPLICATION OF MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE CETA PRIME SPONSORS.
20. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD REDUCE BARRIERS WHICH DISCOURAGE THE ENROLLMENT OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN HIGH TECHNOLOGY FIELDS THROUGH COUNSELING, AND LINKAGES BETWEEN REMEDIAL PROGRAMS (ESPECIALLY IN MATHEMATICS) AND THE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.
21. THE STATE SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE REGIONALIZATION OF HIGH COST TECHNICAL PROGRAMS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES THROUGH DIFFERENTIAL FUNDING.
22. FACULTIES AT EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE SHOULD UNDERTAKE A REEXAMINATION OF GENERAL EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND OFFERINGS.
23. CAREER COUNSELING SERVICES AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED TO MEET THE DIVERSE NEEDS OF THEIR STUDENTS AND REFLECT THE BROAD RANGE OF AVAILABLE COURSE OFFERINGS.
24. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD PLAY A MAJOR ROLE IN ENHANCING THE SOCIAL, RECREATIONAL, AND CULTURAL LIFE OF THEIR COMMUNITIES.
25. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD ASSESS THE COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS OF THEIR COUNTIES AND PROVIDE THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES IDENTIFIED.
26. COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE THEIR EFFORTS TO MEET THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF ADULT STUDENTS IN JOB-RELATED PROGRAMS AS WELL AS OTHER EDUCATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL PURSUITS.
27. PROGRAMS OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AT EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO ENSURE THAT THE SKILLS OF FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, AND STAFF ARE UPGRADED REGULARLY, AND THAT THE IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT IS RECOGNIZED.

GOVERNANCE

28. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE BOARDS SHOULD REFLECT THE DIVERSITY OF EXPERTISE NEEDED BY THE BOARD AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COLLEGE AND THE COUNTY IN WHICH THEY ARE LOCATED.
29. THE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS SHOULD NO LONGER BE A MANDATED MEMBER OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE BOARDS.
30. ALL ELECTED GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SHOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM SERVING AS TRUSTEES.
31. NO INDIVIDUAL SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO SERVE AS A TRUSTEE AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE WHERE HE OR SHE IS EMPLOYED.

32. THE PRESIDENT SHOULD SERVE AS A TRUSTEE, *EX OFFICIO*, WITHOUT VOTE.
33. THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD BE AUTHORIZED TO APPOINT TWO OF THE NINE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE TRUSTEE BOARDS AT EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE.
34. COUNTY-BASED SEARCH COMMITTEES SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE PURPOSE OF NOMINATING TRUSTEE CANDIDATES TO TRUSTEE APPOINTING AUTHORITIES.
35. THE LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING THE HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING AGENCY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMISSION MODELS SHOULD BE REVISED SO THAT THE APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES AND COMPOSITION OF THEIR TRUSTEE BOARDS PARALLEL THOSE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES.
36. FINAL AUTHORITY FOR PLANNING, POLICY, AND EVALUATION IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, BUT THE PLANNING PROCESS SHOULD BE OPEN TO ALL CONSTITUENTS (E.G., FACULTY, STUDENTS, STAFF, ADMINISTRATION).
37. A COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE PROGRAM OF NEW TRUSTEE ORIENTATION AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED TO ENABLE TRUSTEES TO SERVE THEIR COLLEGES EFFECTIVELY.
38. A COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE SHOULD NOT BE ELIGIBLE TO ACCEPT APPOINTMENT AS AN EMPLOYEE OF HIS OR HER COLLEGE FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS FOLLOWING RESIGNATION OR EXPIRATION OF TERM.
39. COMMUNITY COLLEGES, COORDINATING AGENCIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMISSIONS SHOULD BE STATUTORILY EXEMPT FROM THE PROVISIONS OF THE OPTIONAL COUNTY CHARTER ACT.
40. THE COMMISSION ENDORSES THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT OF THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO INTERVENE IN THE OPERATIONS OF A COMMUNITY COLLEGE.
41. THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD SERVE AS A RESOURCE TO THE BOARDS OF SCHOOL ESTIMATE IN THEIR REVIEW OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUDGETS.
42. THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD REVIEW THE CURRENT LAW GOVERNING THE RIGHTS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS TO DETERMINE WHETHER IT SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH SEPARATE LEGISLATION SPECIFIC TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SECTOR.
43. A REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS FOR NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN.
44. THE COUNCIL OF COUNTY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE TO SERVE AS AN ADVISORY BODY, AND EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE TO ENHANCE ITS EFFECTIVENESS.

FINANCING

45. THE STATE SHOULD CATEGORICALLY FUND: THOSE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS IMPOSED ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY FEDERAL AND STATE STATUTES, MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES, AND OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE TO THE STATE.
46. STATE AID AMONG THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE PROVIDED SO THAT DIFFERENCES IN PROGRAM COSTS ARE RECOGNIZED (DIFFERENTIAL FUNDING).
47. THE STATE FINANCE PLAN FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD PROVIDE FOR ANNUAL FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS AT THE SAME RATE PER FTE STUDENT AT WHICH FTE AID TO OTHER SECTORS IS CHANGED.

48. THE STATE SHOULD INCREASE ITS SUPPORT TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SECTOR OVER FIVE YEARS BY A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT TO BRING ITS SUPPORT TO A LEVEL NOT LESS THAN 43% BUT WITHIN 50% OF OPERATIONAL COSTS.
49. THE COUNTY GOVERNMENTS SHOULD NOT DECREASE THEIR LEVEL OF SUPPORT PER FTE AS STATE AID INCREASES.
50. TUITION AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD NOT EXCEED 25% OF THE AVERAGE EDUCATIONAL COST PER FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT STUDENT.
51. THE CURRENT LEGISLATION GOVERNING THE CHARGEBACK ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN COUNTIES SHOULD BE REVISED TO REQUIRE REIMBURSEMENT AT A RATE EQUAL TO THE AVERAGE COST OF THE PROGRAM.
52. THE STATE SHOULD CONTINUE ITS ANNUAL GRANT OF \$30 PER FTE (ADJUSTED ANNUALLY) TO EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE IF MATCHED BY THE COUNTY FOR THE PURPOSE OF RENEWAL AND REPLACEMENT OF EQUIPMENT, MINOR RENOVATION AND MAINTENANCE, AND LIBRARY MATERIALS.
53. THE STATE, BY STATUTE, SHOULD PERMIT COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO ACCUMULATE AND MAINTAIN A RESERVE, WITHIN SPECIFIED LIMITS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES.
54. STATE FINANCIAL AID SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO PART-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CREDIT COURSES.
55. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FTE CALCULATION SHOULD BE CONGRUENT WITH OTHER SECTORS WHILE RETAINING ATTRIBUTES UNIQUE TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNCTIONS WHICH ARE PART OF THE PRESENT FORMULA.
56. STATE AID TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE PROVIDED ON A QUARTERLY BASIS.

EXCELLENCE AND THE OPEN DOOR: AN ESSENTIAL PARTNERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

Historically, higher education in America was the privilege of a few, rather than the opportunity of the majority. In the early 1800s, the classical curriculum served primarily to preserve and transmit culture and tradition. The nineteenth century saw the establishment of new types of collegiate institutions resulting from such social phenomena as the extension of educational opportunity to women, the free school movement, and the development of industry.

The demand for skilled labor in business, industry, and agriculture prompted the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862, and further extended educational access through the vehicle of the land grant college. These institutions, through their philosophy of practicality, service, and educational opportunity for all who could profit from it, brought about dramatic changes in higher education.

The two-year community colleges, which have been called the only uniquely American contribution to higher education, built upon that tradition and the upward extension of the secondary school. The first publicly supported two-year college was established in Joliet, Illinois in 1901. In California, which has developed the most extensive system of community colleges in the United States, the first two-year institution opened its doors in 1910. Nationwide there are now over 1,100 two-year colleges enrolling approximately four million students. Community colleges constitute one third of all higher education institutions and enroll over fifty percent of all undergraduates. They are not on the periphery; they are at the core of American higher education.

New Jersey's community college movement is of more recent origin. First came the County College Act of 1962. Four years later, the first institutions authorized by the Act began operations. By 1969, thirteen counties had public two-year colleges. In the relatively brief period between 1966 and 1979 a total of seventeen entities delivering community college services have been established—fifteen colleges, one community college commission and one higher education coordinating agency. Their combined enrollment is approximately 98,500 students (Fall 1978)—a number almost equal to the combined enrollments of the State's public four-year institutions. This is an extraordinary achievement.

Given this impressive track record, we see no reason for basic change. After a decade of phenomenal quantitative growth, qualitative adjustment and fine tuning must be the agenda for the 80s.

Throughout this report the Commission refers most often to the entities providing public two-year postsecondary education as community colleges, although in New Jersey they are more commonly called county colleges. It is our view that the term community college underscores the community-based nature and emphasis of these institutions—a characteristic which contributes significantly to the uniqueness of this sector.

It should also be noted that, in this report, the term community or county college has been used to refer to all legislated organizational models, i.e., county colleges, county higher education coordinating agencies, and county community college commissions (descriptions of these models appear in the Governance section of this report). Where a recommendation specifically addresses the agency or commission arrangement, the appropriate terminology is used.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE MISSION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Background

The following recommendations address the basic statement of mission and the comprehensive curriculum model and functions which support that mission, educational standards, and boun-

dary questions related to other sectors of higher education. A final series of recommendations flows from consideration of the several functions performed by comprehensive community colleges.

The major missions of the county colleges are set forth in *A Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of New Jersey*, Phase II, 1974:

1. To be the open door to higher education in New Jersey, with a particular obligation to people who are uncertain about their educational interests or abilities and want to explore a variety of occupational and academic programs. In public higher education this mission shall be reserved for the county community colleges. To carry it out, the colleges must have a sufficient mix of occupational and liberal arts programs and must offer students a broad array of counseling and tutorial services. This will assist people of all ages in broadening their skills and in raising the level of their aspirations and accomplishments as far as their abilities and interests will take them.
2. To provide academic programs equivalent to the first two years of the baccalaureate. In order for these programs to be completely transferable, the two-year and four-year colleges should cooperatively implement the transfer principles stated in Chapter Two of Phase II of the Master Plan.
3. To take the lead in providing post-high-school occupational and vocational programs of shorter duration than baccalaureate programs. In carrying out this mission, they should solicit the cooperation of the vocational technical institutes and other post-secondary institutions to create an integrated statewide system of occupational education within the policy guidance provided by the Educational Coordinating Council.
4. To provide the majority of the state system's part-time undergraduate and general interest education programs.
5. To continue their major role of serving their communities. Their various academic programs are expected to be closely related to the needs of the local community; in addition, they should enrich the communities' cultural life through short courses, special programs, and a variety of formal and informal educational offerings. In this effort, they should give particular attention to programs for minority groups and residents of inner cities, to programs for older adults, and to programs that help resolve diverse and complex community problems.
6. In general, in the public system the associate degree should be limited to the community colleges except in specialized programmatic areas where there are compelling reasons to the contrary. In this way, excessive duplication of programs and facilities will be avoided.

In carrying out its charge the Commission has reviewed this statement of mission within the context of the experience of the community colleges and the priorities that are indicated by the current needs projected for the students, the communities, and the State. We endorse these basic statements of mission, and, in the recommendations which follow, seek to identify those aspects which require further definition and development.

Open Access

RECOMMENDATION 1: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE THE OPEN DOOR TO HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE ENTIRE POPULATION OF NEW JERSEY.

The open access concept is reflected in an admissions policy that permits any person who has a secondary school diploma or equivalent, or who is eighteen years of age, to enroll in a program consistent with his or her abilities and interests.

In implementing this concept, the community colleges have extended access to groups whose needs and abilities were previously underserved by higher education. These individuals, often

termed "non-traditional" or "new" students, include those attending part-time day or evening classes because they are employed full-time; professionals who return to school to meet increased skill or licensing requirements; senior citizens; handicapped persons; those requiring bilingual programs; adults aged 25 and older; educationally disadvantaged individuals; and those returning to school for personal growth and self-improvement.

Another type of non-traditional student who can be served by the community college is the high school senior. One of the major factors contributing to drop-out in all sectors of education is boredom. Often, students in the last year of secondary school feel that they are merely "marking time" until they graduate. Cooperative ventures between the community colleges and the high schools—like concurrent enrollment programs—have proven valuable for both the institutions and the individuals. The students are able to participate in stimulating learning activities, and the colleges can offer a first hand look at the array of existing academic programs and services. The Commission strongly endorses such endeavors and would encourage the community colleges to further explore the development of cooperative programs with the secondary school sector.

By 1978 women comprised over fifty-six percent (56%) of total New Jersey community college enrollments, members of minority groups sixteen percent (16%), and adults aged twenty-five and over forty-one percent (41%). The open door admissions policy has been, in large part, responsible for this representation; the Commission supports the desirability of continued service to these groups, and would underscore the need for heightened efforts with regard to handicapped populations.

RECOMMENDATION 2: TUITION AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD REMAIN LOW SO THAT IT DOES NOT BECOME A BARRIER TO ATTENDANCE.

As the only sector of higher education committed to open access, community college tuition charges should be lower than those of Rutgers and the state colleges. In 1978-79 tuition rates at the community colleges ranged from \$400 to \$500 (the state mandated maximum) per year full-time, with the majority of institutions charging the maximum. Full-time resident tuition rates at Rutgers and the state colleges in 1978-79 were \$760 and \$704, respectively.

Public two-year colleges serve many low to moderate income students and working adults who would be unable to participate in higher education if low cost programs were not available. Because many community college students attend classes part-time, or own homes, they are not eligible for most kinds of tuition aid. The Commission endorses the present low rate, and would support even lower levels of student tuition in the event of increases in contributions from other funding sources.

RECOMMENDATION 3: COUNTY BOUNDARIES SHOULD NOT SERVE AS BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ATTENDANCE.

Presently, a student who resides in a county which has a community college, and who desires to enroll in a program of study or a particular course at another community college, must pay higher out-of-county tuition rates if that program (or course) is also available at the student's "home" institution. The out-of-county rate does not apply where 1) there is no community college in the student's county of residence; or 2) there is no corresponding program of study (or course) in the "home" institution.

It is the Commission's view that the limitations related to the crossing of county boundaries are serving to limit access, and are not realistic in light of the increased number of adult and part-time students attending community colleges. Many of these students are employed, and convenience of location may be related to the workplace, not the place of residence.

Thus, the Commission suggests the following strategy: if either the student's residence or place of work is 20 miles or more from the "home" community college, and if there is another community college *which is closer*, then the option is the student's, with no differential in tuition rate.

RECOMMENDATION 4: COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES SHOULD BE MADE MORE AVAILABLE TO POPULATION CENTERS THROUGH SATELLITE CAMPUSES AND BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

On the basis of institutional self-studies prepared by the colleges and follow-up site visits by its accreditation teams, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools has observed that, given the absence of extensive public transportation in many areas, there is great potential for the establishment of off-site campus facilities (or satellite centers). The colleges were encouraged to seek out appropriate locations and establish other sites for the delivery of programs and services.

Additional data available to the Commission indicate that there is limited or non-existent public transportation at seven of the seventeen community colleges/coordinating agencies. The community colleges are charged with the responsibility for providing open access to New Jersey's citizens. We are of the view that this includes physical access as well as access of opportunity, and recommend that the feasibility of establishing additional satellite centers, where needed, be seriously investigated. Efforts to secure or arrange improved public transportation are also encouraged.

Educational Standards

RECOMMENDATION 5: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD ESTABLISH ENTRANCE AND PROGRESS STANDARDS FOR DEGREE PROGRAMS TO ENSURE THE HIGH QUALITY OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS.

The Commission wishes to underscore the point that open access does not imply low standards, or poorly prepared students. To the contrary, the commitment to open access serves only to emphasize the institution's responsibility for enabling students to engage successfully in the collegiate educational experience. We believe that there are several key issues related to the delivery of high quality programs by community colleges: increased emphasis upon remedial or developmental instruction; entrance and progress standards; institutional research efforts (including longitudinal studies) which will provide data regarding the effectiveness of educational strategies; and systematic collection and analysis of institutional enrollment, persistence, and exit data.

There has been considerable controversy in New Jersey over standards in the primary and secondary schools. The Commission believes that, whatever standards might be imposed upon students emerging from the secondary schools, entrance to degree programs in community colleges should be based upon their criteria, and, where necessary, their assessment of basic skills competency.

Where a student's eligibility for entrance into a degree, certificate or diploma program is contingent upon his or her successful completion of remedial work, it is the Commission's view that this is not college level work and should not be credit-bearing. Some institutions may have developed innovative programs which represent exceptions to this rule (e.g., a six semester hour program of instruction which begins with basic skills and progresses through entry level college work may be appropriately classified as a two credit course). In these instances, the burden of proof is on the institution or department which puts forth exceptions.

In setting standards, the community colleges should establish realistic requirements for entry into various programs and reasonable progress requirements. The latter are also important in remedial or developmental courses where the ultimate objective is entry into regular educational programs. These requirements should not operate as barriers to access, but should serve to ensure the admission of prepared students capable of fully participating in a program of study.

RECOMMENDATION 6. THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD DEVELOP A DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM TO ENSURE A CORE OF INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING.

Basic to the setting of standards is the availability of good statistics and research on which to make judgments. The Commission was generally disappointed with the quantity and quality of available data—even basic data with regard to persistence, attrition, etc. Both institutional and statewide data gathering on a systematic basis are essential.

Comprehensive Mission

RECOMMENDATION 7: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD RETAIN THEIR COMPREHENSIVE MISSION.

The open access mission leads almost inevitably to an endorsement of the existing comprehensive curricular model—that is, an institution offering a diversity of credit and non-credit academic and career programs and community services to meet the needs of a wide variety of people. The Commission considered but rejected other alternatives; in those states with two-year extensions of the state university, career programs tend to be slighted, while in states with technical institutes, academic programs are deemphasized.

The community colleges were established to serve as multipurpose institutions. Their programs and services are reflective of the needs of the communities in which they are located. As student populations and numbers of community colleges have increased, a relatively well defined set of educational responsibilities has evolved. As cited earlier, *A Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of New Jersey*, Phase II, 1974 calls for the community colleges to provide “academic programs equivalent to the first two years of the baccalaureate,” “post-high-school occupational and vocational programs of shorter duration than baccalaureate programs,” “general interest education programs,” and community service programs.

RECOMMENDATION 8: IN KEEPING WITH THEIR COMPREHENSIVE MISSION, THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD FOCUS ON: ACADEMIC TRANSFER PROGRAMS, CAREER OR OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS, GENERAL EDUCATION, REMEDIATION AND BASIC SKILLS, ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, COUNSELING PROGRAMS, PUBLIC/COMMUNITY SERVICE, AND TEACHING RATHER THAN RESEARCH.

The Commission wishes to underscore that, in endorsing the philosophy of comprehensiveness, we are not suggesting that each institution offer the same range of programs but rather that the community college system as a whole be comprehensive. Individual institutions may and should emphasize certain areas such as specific occupational programs, liberal arts or basic skills. It is the comprehensive pattern of programs and services which makes the community colleges unique in New Jersey's system of higher education.

In addition to endorsing the broad philosophy of comprehensiveness, the Commission has considered each of the defined functions. Specific recommendations related to these begin on page 19.

Articulation

There are several boundary problems related to the effective articulation of programs and services among the various sectors of postsecondary education which require resolution. As institutions compete for students in this era of stabilized or shrinking enrollments and resources, it is useful to define boundaries where real and legitimate ones exist. While some competition makes sense in a healthy educational delivery system, unnecessary duplication of services should be prevented.

The Commission has identified several aspects related to the articulation of programs and ser-

vices between the community colleges and the public four-year institutions which deserve consideration. These include occupational education, admission standards, extension services, and inter-institutional planning in urban areas.

RECOMMENDATION 9: RUTGERS AND THE STATE COLLEGES SHOULD OFFER ONLY BONA FIDE FOUR-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL/TECHNICAL PROGRAMS.

Where there is obvious need for occupational education related to the baccalaureate degree level, Rutgers and the state colleges should rightfully serve as the primary providers of these programs. However, there is the potential for inflation of two-year programs into four-year programs where this is not justified by course level and/or content. Aside from the problems of duplication and inefficient use of resources this represents, there is a concern for the impact of this phenomenon on the economic accessibility of occupational education to students.

RECOMMENDATION 10: RUTGERS AND THE STATE COLLEGES SHOULD SEEK TO ATTRACT THE SUBSTANTIAL PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO PURSUE HIGHER EDUCATION OUTSIDE THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

As enrollments stabilize and decline, there is the possibility that the public four-year institutions will begin to recruit students that they have not sought to enroll in the past. The Commission is concerned that their recruitment efforts not focus upon the traditional community college population, but rather, would strongly recommend that the four-year colleges seek to attract those students who presently leave the state to attend college. While we believe generally that the maintenance or raising of admission standards, and program and facility development (e.g., new courses, dormitory facilities) would serve to make these institutions more attractive to New Jersey students, careful analyses would certainly be required before any major changes were made.

Attention should also be given to increased cooperation with the community colleges in the areas of counseling, curriculum development, and placement to facilitate the transfer of a greater number of community college students from a broader set of two-year programs to Rutgers and the state colleges.

RECOMMENDATION 11: RUTGERS AND THE STATE COLLEGES SHOULD LIMIT THEIR EXTENSION PROGRAMS TO THOSE LOWER DIVISION AND NON-CREDIT COURSES NOT AVAILABLE THROUGH THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND EXPAND THEIR UPPER DIVISION AND GRADUATE LEVEL OFFERINGS.

Rutgers and the state colleges have established extension centers (or "out reach" centers) which offer lower division and non-credit courses which parallel many community college offerings. While these centers provide access in areas where there are no community colleges to offer such services, they represent duplication when located close to community college facilities.

The Commission encourages Rutgers and the state colleges to offer upper division and graduate level courses in the extension centers, and limit their lower division and non-credit offerings to those geographic areas not served by community colleges. They should also consider the provision of part-time, upper division technical and occupational courses. Where feasible, the four-year institutions should consider the possibility of utilizing community college facilities in delivering their services, and draw upon the capabilities of the two-year colleges in disseminating their program information to the local communities. The Department of Higher Education should coordinate the delivery of extension services to ensure that local needs are met and that college facilities and resources are fully utilized.

RECOMMENDATION 12: FORMAL INTER-INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COUNCILS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN URBAN AREAS WHERE COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE LOCATED IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO OTHER PUBLICLY SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

This recommendation is an extension of the desired general articulation between sectors of higher education, and is designed to facilitate resource sharing, formal transfer relationships,

and effective planning as a means of maximizing the benefits of higher education to the state's major urban areas.

RECOMMENDATION 13: FULL-FAITH-AND-CREDIT AGREEMENTS SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY, AND TO APPLY TO STUDENTS IN OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS.

From the data available, it appears that the community colleges do retain sizeable portions of their transfer program enrollments on to graduation, and these students are generally well prepared to continue their studies at senior institutions.

A full-faith-and-credit policy was formulated by the Council of State Colleges and Council of County Colleges and adopted by the Board of Higher Education to govern the transfer of course credit between the community colleges, Edison College, and the state colleges. The intent of the policy was to develop a system-wide approach for public higher education in New Jersey; credits earned at the community colleges were to be recognized as college credits equal to those earned at the four-year institutions.

While this policy, in practice, has not been problem-free, its major limitations have related to its restrictions. Presently, the agreement is limited to the four-year institutions cited above, and to students in arts and sciences programs.

The growth of occupational programs of four years' duration has resulted in an increase in the number of students enrolled in vocational programs seeking transfer to colleges and universities. There is a need to facilitate the access of these students to a broadened set of four-year institutions, and assure that they are not required to repeat courses and material they have successfully completed at the community colleges.

The Key Functions of Comprehensive Community Colleges

There are several key functions that must be performed if the community colleges are to carry out the full range of their comprehensive mission:

Academic Transfer

RECOMMENDATION 14: THE COMMISSION ENDORSES THE LONG-STANDING ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO OFFER THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM.

The goal of the transfer program offered at the two-year college is to provide qualified students to colleges and universities at the upper division level. This is accomplished through the admission of university caliber students into a program of instruction comparable to that provided lower division students at four-year institutions.

The case for offering baccalaureate-oriented instruction in the community colleges is primarily based on the issue of access. Opportunity for higher education is less dependent on personal wealth if the first two years can be obtained locally at low cost. Also, marginal students who might not be admitted to the state universities may begin as general studies students in the junior college and work their way into the baccalaureate program through the necessary preparatory courses. (*The Illinois Public Junior College System: A Program Review, 1973*)

Although there has been a recent downward trend in enrollment in the arts and sciences, about 44.2% of the total associate degrees conferred in 1978-79 were in the Arts and Sciences, General category. With regard to the effectiveness of county college transfer programs in preparing students for upper level academic work, a recent Department of Higher Education study concluded that:

- As a group, graduates of the county colleges perform as well in 4-year institutions as do native (i.e., those who entered as freshmen) students.
- A drop in grade point average upon transfer to another college was not a general phenomenon. In fact, approximately as many students showed increased G.P.A.s as decreased.

(Miller, et al, *The Academic Achievement of Two-Year College Graduates in New Jersey Four-Year Colleges*, 1977)

Remediation/Developmental Education

Claims are made that there are community college students who cannot read and write. The report of the New Jersey Basic Skills Council (November 1978) provides compelling evidence that skill deficiencies in reading, writing, and mathematics are not limited to those students enrolling in two-year institutions.

More than 42,000 first-year students entering New Jersey public colleges and universities, and four independent colleges, took the New Jersey College Basic Skills Placement Test (NJCBSPT) in the fall of 1978. Table 1 (below) provides a breakdown, by sector, of those students scoring below a scaled score of 65 on the Total English, Composition, and Computation components of the test. Statewide, 39% of the students tested revealed reading deficiencies; 43%, writing deficiencies, and 45%, arithmetic (computation) deficiencies.

There is general public alarm over the nature of the problem and its proportions. The Commission is convinced of the importance of remediation in higher education; without such programs a significant percentage of aspiring students would be unable to participate fully or successfully in their collegiate studies.

TABLE 1
Number of Students Not Achieving a Scaled Score of 65*

	Two-year Colleges		State Colleges		Rutgers University	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total English	12,439	54	3,744	35	1,241	17
Composition	12,698	55	3,853	36	1,317	18
Computation	13,505	58	4,107	38	1,236	17
	N = 23,390		N = 10,840		N = 7,322	

*A scaled score of 65 or above was determined to represent an adequate grasp of those basic skills necessary for success in regular, first year, college level courses.

RECOMMENDATION 15: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD OFFER A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES TO PROVIDE BASIC ACADEMIC, SOCIAL AND/OR BEHAVIORAL SKILLS TO INDIVIDUALS NEEDING REMEDIATION AND PROVIDE SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT TO ENSURE THEIR IDENTIFICATION AND PROPER PLACEMENT WITHIN THE PROGRAM.

Although there are now comprehensive data on the nature and extent of the basic skills problems in New Jersey higher education, the solution is not simply an "all out" effort to fund, develop, and staff an adequate number of classes in reading, writing, and arithmetic. The issue of effective remediation—especially in the community college setting—is a very complex one.

The open door admissions policy has resulted in a heterogeneous student population which includes the "high risk" student (i.e., the person who either scored below a given percentile on the institution's placement test, or who did not achieve a C average in high school), who might not otherwise have had access to higher education. In meeting the academic needs of these students, the institutions must be innovative and resourceful, as instructional strategies that were successful in the past have proven to be less useful with the non-traditional populations served by community colleges.

A term often used synonymously with remediation is developmental education. While the two are similar, there is an important distinction. The term remediation refers to instruction designed to improve or overcome any deficiency in content or skills previously taught but not

learned. Developmental education includes within its definition the objective of remediation but has the additional purposes of "... the removal of deficiencies of knowledge in order to qualify for instruction for which the student was previously ineligible, and, ... the development of positive attitudes toward learning, working, and others." (Shanahan, et al, *Statewide Community College Services*, 1977)

Research on the effectiveness of remedial or developmental efforts in community colleges has increasingly found that comprehensive programs (i.e., programs which address both the behavioral skill deficiencies and the basic or academic skill deficiencies of the student) produce significantly greater and broader positive results than do programs designed to address primarily academic components. This is of primary importance in the public two-year college, as the source of academic problems may be a combination of cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral factors. Very often students requiring remediation are those for whom schooling has been unpleasant; they have generally been closer to failure than success. Lacking self-confidence, direction, and basic verbal and mathematical skills, they present a challenge to even the most dedicated instructor.

Information from the New Jersey Basic Skills Council indicates that, although there are many fine developmental programs in existence, the quality overall is uneven, and the diversity of remedial services varies widely. For example, the number of full and part-time faculty teaching in remedial programs ranges from four to 103; program evaluation efforts range from simple tracking analyses to sophisticated multiphase longitudinal studies.

A variety of diagnostic instruments are being utilized by the colleges to place students in developmental programs. These, and other appropriate measures that may be identified by the institutions, should serve as a battery of instruments for assessing learning readiness, social maturity, and academic skill development.

Just as the array of developmental services must address the diverse nature of the students for whom they are designed, they must also reflect the range of curricula offered by the colleges. Developmental education must address the needs of unprepared students who seek to obtain occupational training as well as those interested in liberal arts or general education.

It has been argued that an emphasis on developmental programs in the community college sector may have a negative impact on the status of the institutions and on their academic standards. We believe that effective remedial education efforts will reflect favorably upon the community colleges if the output of the institutions (e.g., associate degree graduates, transfer students, skilled technicians) is of consistently high quality and quantity. Open access refers only to entrance into an institution; it does not ensure the entrance into programs of underprepared or underskilled persons. The developmental services which the open door policy obligates the community colleges to provide can be an opportunity for excellence if the issue is responsibly addressed.

Occupational/Vocational Education and Manpower Development

Occupational education is generally defined as instruction designed to provide the student with job skills necessary for employment or required for retraining or advancement in one's present occupation. In the two-year institution, occupational education usually pertains to occupations considered skilled and semi-skilled, technical, or semiprofessional, and which generally do not require a baccalaureate or higher degree. (Shanahan, et al, *Statewide Community College Services*, 1977)

Because of rapid technological advances and the effects of economic fluctuations, the working person today faces a world in which occupational outlooks are constantly changing. The community colleges provide students with general, liberal arts courses in addition to technical skills training. This broadened educational opportunity, in addition to general accessibility and low tuition, make the public two-year sector an especially attractive deliverer of occupational education.

RECOMMENDATION 16: THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF CREDIT AND NON-CREDIT OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IS A HIGH PRIORITY; IMMEDIATE ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THIS ISSUE.

Nationwide, there is a growing demand on the part of students for occupational training, and a growing need on the part of business and industry for a skilled workforce. In New Jersey similar trends are apparent. Over half (50.6%) of the associate degrees conferred in 1975 were in occupational and career programs. By 1978 that percentage had increased to 55.8%. Full time enrollments in Occupational and Career Programs numbered 17,551 in 1978 as compared to 16,102 in 1974. Labor projections point toward an improved job market for occupations requiring less than a four year degree. For example, greater emphasis on medical services and the expanding use of computers point to projected increases in the professional, technical and kindred job category of almost 30% between 1974 and 1985. Service workers (e.g., cooks, nurses, dental assistants, police, and firefighters) are expected to comprise almost 13% of all workers by 1985. This equates to approximately 98,600 additional jobs.

Occupational education is a crucial area, given the dynamics of social and technical change, and the Commission supports the increased commitment of community college resources to the development and delivery of both credit (e.g., degree, certificate, diploma) and non-credit occupational programs.

High technology programs represent a significant financial commitment because of costly equipment and the scarcity of qualified instructors. It would seem reasonable that contracting with business and industry to provide training and/or facilities in certain technological fields would be a useful enterprise for most community colleges. Of course, cooperative ventures need not be limited to the conduct of technical training; a significant proportion of the hundreds of thousands of training dollars expended annually by business and industry are for educational programs in management, communication, and secretarial skills. Also, union tuition-reimbursement plans are not fully utilized. Another alternative which needs to be actively explored is the review by higher education institutions/agencies of the training programs offered by business, governmental agencies, and non-profit corporations to determine whether such training could be articulated with a degree program. Increased emphasis on cooperative education arrangements with industry is also desirable.

There are many opportunities for cooperative ventures between the community colleges and the industrial sector; several institutions have developed such programs. The community colleges should be much more aggressive in establishing communications with business, industry, and unions and in effecting cooperative programs.

The notion that postsecondary education implies general education at the collegiate level, as well as occupational training, is supported by the Commission. We believe that it is desirable for postsecondary students to be afforded a combination of general and occupational education; it is this combination which is the primary distinction between the county colleges and the Area Vocational Technical Schools (AVTSs).

RECOMMENDATION 17: THE AREA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOLS SHOULD NOT DEVELOP NEW POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS AND EXISTING PROGRAMS SHOULD BE COORDINATED WITH COMMUNITY COLLEGE OFFERINGS.

There have recently been signed cooperative agreements between some community colleges and AVTSs, and these might serve as models for strengthened coordination effort. To date, ten of the county colleges have signed contractual agreements with area vocational technical schools for the purpose of promoting flexibility, planning, and maximum utilization of facilities; five colleges are currently negotiating similar agreements. It would appear that there is sufficient communication and cooperation between these sectors to allay concerns that there is major unnecessary duplication of effort and competition for students. Because of the potential for both of these problems, however, the effectiveness of these cooperative agreements should be evaluated periodically.

The Commission's basic reason for urging a moratorium on new AVTS postsecondary programs is the fact that there are large unmet needs in secondary schools for occupational programs. Although they offer postsecondary programs, the primary mission of the AVTSs is secondary education.

RECOMMENDATION 18: A SINGLE STATEWIDE BODY SHOULD BE VESTED WITH THE AUTHORITY TO COORDINATE THE DELIVERY OF MANPOWER TRAINING SERVICES IN NEW JERSEY, AND TO ALLOCATE FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS FOR OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING.

The New Jersey Advisory Council on Vocational Education has repeatedly called for an identified agency or consortium of agencies to coordinate the manpower training activities of the numerous state agencies and systems involved.

A major study conducted by the Institute of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers on the network of education and training systems in New Jersey concluded that:

... it is evident that despite the large numbers of people and dollars involved, there are great gaps in quality, distribution, and integration of these resources. What is needed is more than awareness and better accounting. Imperative is real collaboration which focuses on specific firms, unions, schools, and programs designed to help more workers, unions, and companies achieve more diversified and effective training and educational opportunity. (*Promising Horizons: Cooperative Opportunities Among Labor, Management, Education, and CETA in New Jersey, 1977*)

The question of articulation becomes even more significant in the face of the heightened activity and growth that presently characterize occupational education. The Commission stresses that increased coordination and communication between the community colleges and the proprietary schools, AVTSs, and four-year institutions offering occupational programs must occur if improved educational opportunity is to be a reality in the state of New Jersey.

RECOMMENDATION 19: IN THEIR COUNTY FISCAL REVIEW ROLE THE FREEHOLDERS SHOULD PREVENT DUPLICATION OF MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE CETA PRIME SPONSORS.

Recent amendments to the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) permit community colleges to be assigned as the "presumptive" deliverers of postsecondary adult manpower training, either by direct offerings or contract arrangements with other institutions, such as proprietary schools. This would prevent the development under CETA of a third public vocational education system and would assure, through accreditation and state licensing, strong quality control over a large proportion of postsecondary/adult programs.

The freeholders, in their county fiscal review roles, participate in the budget process for both the community colleges and the CETA Prime Sponsors. In this capacity they can assure that the training programs of these two deliverers do not overlap unnecessarily.

The two-year colleges can—and should—assume major responsibility for the training of semi-professional technical personnel because they are in the best position to offer a balanced educational opportunity. Courses in the student's major field of study are intended to provide him or her with sufficient skills to obtain employment; remedial and developmental programs ensure preparedness; and liberal arts or general education courses provide the broadening experiences for full participation in the community, and for accommodation to change in his or her chosen field.

RECOMMENDATION 20: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD REDUCE BARRIERS WHICH DISCOURAGE THE ENROLLMENT OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN HIGH TECHNOLOGY FIELDS THROUGH COUNSELING AND LINKAGES BETWEEN REMEDIAL PROGRAMS (ESPECIALLY IN MATHEMATICS) AND THE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.

The community colleges have a responsibility and an opportunity to link together two major problems and find a solution for both. The first is the need for many more skilled workers in

high technology fields. The second is the underrepresentation of women and minorities in many occupational and technical programs. Table 2 (below) shows the distribution of Blacks and Hispanics in the various major fields.

One reason for these low enrollments is insufficient counseling at the junior and senior high schools. Students need complete and timely information regarding career opportunities in the technologies and the educational preparation needed for entry into training programs. Such counseling should be designed to motivate all students—especially women and minorities—and to ensure that they have sufficient mathematical and basic skills preparation so that a wide variety of educational options is open to them. At the postsecondary level, where students lack proficiency in the basic skills, linkages between remedial and technical programs must be established.

A related concern is the placement of students who have graduated from occupational/technical programs. The Commission is aware that there are some occupations in which women and minorities are seriously underrepresented. While ensuring that there are increased numbers of qualified individuals to compete for jobs in these areas addresses one aspect of the problem, other efforts are required.

Students should only be encouraged to enroll in occupational programs where known manpower needs exist and where employment opportunities are available. For example, if certain occupations are not open to prior offenders, this should be explained to all students before admission to relevant programs. Where these restrictions seem unwarranted, the community colleges should work to have them rescinded. Where there are less formal social barriers to employment opportunities, the community colleges should aggressively seek to place their qualified graduates. The proprietary schools have proven to be very successful in the placement of their students, and in this respect can serve as a good model for the community colleges.

TABLE 2
Associate Degree Recipients in N. J. County Colleges
by Major Field Within Ethnic Groups: 1977-78

Data Processing Technologies		Bus. & Commerce Technologies	
(% of Total Degrees)	(3.1)	(% of Total Degrees)	(21.0)
% of Black Total	2.7	% of Black Total	23.8
% of Hispanic Total	6.5	% of Hispanic Total	8.1
% of All Other Total	3.0	% of All Other Total	19.6
Health Services Technologies		Public Service Technologies	
(% of Total Degrees)	(17.4)	(% of Total Degrees)	(6.8)
% of Black Total	12.3	% of Black Total	11.0
% of Hispanic Total	16.6	% of Hispanic Total	13.0
% of All Other Total	17.8	% of All Other Total	6.3
Mech. & Eng'g. Technologies		Arts and Sciences, General	
(% of Total Degrees)	(6.4)	(% of Total Degrees)	(44.2)
% of Black Total	4.1	% of Black Total	47.4
% of Hispanic Total	9.5	% of Hispanic Total	39.6
% of All Other Total	6.6	% of All Other Total	44.0
Natural Science Technologies		Total All Associate Degrees	
(% of Total Degrees)	(1.1)	(Total Degrees-100%)	(9,751)
% of Black Total	0.0	Total for Blacks (100%)	873
% of Hispanic Total	0.6	Total for Hispanics (100%)	169
% of All Other Total	1.2	Total for All Other (100%)	8,709

"All Other" includes whites, non-Black/non-Hispanic minorities, non-resident aliens and unknown. Source: NCES Form 2300-2.1B.

RECOMMENDATION 21: THE STATE SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE REGIONALIZATION OF HIGH COST TECHNICAL PROGRAMS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES THROUGH DIFFERENTIAL FUNDING.

It is the Commission's view that regionalization—i.e., the selective location of an instructional program based upon institutional resources, availability of students, and the training needs of the community/region/state—will promote economy and broaden access.

Many high technology programs represent prohibitive expense to community colleges because of their low enrollment due to limited resources and/or limited student interest. For example, enrollment in the Middlesex County College dental hygienist program is restricted to thirty students per year because of the costly equipment required to conduct the program. While these high cost courses are primarily occupational, other such activities include remedial or developmental programs, and programs geared to the needs of handicapped students. Both require costly materials and facilities, and specially trained instructors.

It is recommended that, to prevent duplication and inefficient use of resources, the State identify statewide needs in specialized areas, and request and review proposals from appropriate institutions for programs to meet these needs. We also recommend that individual community colleges submit proposals to the State where they have identified training needs and wish to develop the resources to effectively address them.

In encouraging community colleges to draw upon a larger student population than exists within their respective counties and to increase the utilization of their facilities in the delivery of educational services, efficiency is realized, and access to educational opportunity for New Jersey's citizens is broadened.

General Education

General Education is a distinguishing factor which sets community colleges apart from purely vocational training. As we have cited previously, the Commission endorses the philosophy that postsecondary programs should include collegiate level general education courses; this enables students in liberal arts transfer programs, matriculated students with undeclared majors, those enrolled in occupational programs and many others to have a shared educational experience and provides a core of basic knowledge.

The General Education program at a comprehensive community college includes a range of courses in such subjects as fine arts and humanities, civic development, social and behavioral sciences, and biological and physical sciences. While this diversity represents a major strength of General Education, it also contributes to the lack of understanding and misunderstanding which exist regarding its purpose and value.

RECOMMENDATION 22: FACULTIES AT EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE SHOULD UNDERTAKE A REEXAMINATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS AND OFFERINGS.

Other institutions have engaged in similar activities. At Miami-Dade Community College (Florida) a reexamination of the function and goals of General Education was completed in 1978. An excerpt from their report, *General Education in a Changing Society*, offers this rationale:

... education should be viewed in its broadest sense. While the College should do whatever is necessary to provide students with specialized skills required for particular careers, it should also meet its commitment to enable students to learn whatever is necessary to be effective human beings...

Those supporting occupational and technical education correctly point to the practical value of these programs. The implication often is that the liberal arts courses in history, philosophy, sociology and the humanities are not practical. Yet, unemployment has not been the only great concern in American society. Environmental problems are considerable. Social ills, crime, poor health, and drug abuse continue to increase. Without doubt, the breakdown in government, as evidenced by widespread national and local governmental corruption, is an indication that the fundamental con-

siderations of the liberal arts disciplines—the nature of man, the nature of the good society, the proper goals of civilization, the relationship between government and the individual, the nature of human liberty—are not simply theoretical, but have extremely practical applications.

In addition, these five goals of general education were cited:

- To enable individuals to integrate their knowledge so that they may draw upon the many sources of learning in making decisions and taking action in daily practical situations;
- to provide students with a beginning or a further commitment to a lifetime of learning;
- to enable students to intensify the process of self-actualization;
- to enable students to find value in the activities and experiences of their lives, both those in which they engage because of obligations or commitments and those which are discretionary in nature; and
- to increase students' understanding of the breadth and depth of ideas, the growth of society and institutions, and the development and application of the scientific process in communities throughout the world.

The Commission strongly recommends a full faculty review of general education on each college campus. The intellectual basis for required general education courses for all students must be firmly established, whether through traditional distribution courses in arts and sciences, inter-disciplinary programs or new departures in curriculum. Statewide conferences and inter-institutional seminars should be organized to explore this topic.

Counseling Services

Students attend community colleges for a variety of reasons. While many enroll with clear occupational goals and a sense of purpose and commitment, there are others who do not. Large numbers of younger students use the community colleges as a testing ground—as a way to find themselves, both personally and occupationally. Many adults also come to the community college unsure of themselves and their directions—exploring career change, or seeking psychological identity after divorce or family breakup. There is probably no other sector of higher education where students are in greater need of personal counseling and career guidance.

RECOMMENDATION 23: CAREER COUNSELING SERVICES AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED TO MEET THE DIVERSE NEEDS OF THEIR STUDENTS AND REFLECT THE BROAD RANGE OF AVAILABLE COURSE OFFERINGS.

With the increased enrollments in occupational courses, the community colleges must ensure that their counseling programs include career guidance and planning services.

There are two target populations which would benefit from such services: people who are presently employed in seemingly dead end jobs with little opportunity for professional and economic growth without further formal postsecondary education; and traditional students who are either matriculated without a field of interest or are in some liberal arts transfer program.

Each of the above category of students can be exposed to a variety of career clusters (a host of relatively specialized and/or technical positions on the same level) and career ladders (an ascending order of positions in a profession which requires increasing knowledge, professional acumen and preparation). In order to assure the adequacy and practicality of the career counseling program, community colleges could work with employers to establish and define job requirements and associated cognitive and technical skills for entry level to top management positions.

As commuter colleges with programs offered morning, afternoon, and evening, the two-year institution has a difficult time providing the kinds of peer interaction that, on residential campuses, go far toward promoting social development and support. As a result, student service personnel must make serious efforts to overcome the isolation that individuals feel on these

transient campuses. Support service activities should be expanded to facilitate use by part-time and off-campus students. These should also be made available to county residents, whether or not they are students at the college, to meet the community's needs for career and educational counseling.

In the course of its accreditation studies of New Jersey community colleges, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools evaluation teams frequently recommended the conduct of a needs analysis of the student populations to permit the design of an array of student services which would contribute to academic success. In institutions where systematic study of the guidance needs of students has not been conducted, the Commission would endorse the Middle States recommendation regarding needs analyses. These studies would contribute to the evaluation of present programs, and permit both short and long-range planning in this area.

One new role for community colleges that arose in Commission discussions should be noted. In many counties there are extremely high rates of youth unemployment—large numbers of young people aged 16 to 21 who are out of school. At present no one follows up on these individuals. The high school counselors close their folders as soon as students either drop out or graduate. The community colleges might perform a highly useful service by monitoring, on an individual basis, these dropouts and graduates who do not go on to college. By working closely with high school counselors, community college personnel could continue the counseling responsibility once a student left secondary school.

Community Services

RECOMMENDATION 24: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD PLAY A MAJOR ROLE IN ENHANCING THE SOCIAL, RECREATIONAL, AND CULTURAL LIFE OF THEIR COMMUNITIES.

The term community college connotes a close interrelationship of the college and the life of the community. The colleges look to the community for suggestions in program planning, and the community looks to the college for an array of services to meet the educational needs of individuals or enterprises within the community. Included in this definition are not only courses and activities offered under the common descriptor of adult education, but also such services as community use of college facilities, and cultural and recreational programs.

To contribute meaningfully to the communities in which they are located, public two-year colleges must allocate sufficient resources to this important role within the comprehensive mission.

In the past the colleges have used their community service programs as well as their credit courses to develop new educational options for their local communities. We endorse continuation of the Board of Higher Education's definition of categories of non-credit courses which are fundable. These include remedial courses, developmental courses (i.e., courses to develop occupational skills related to securing initial employment or upgrading present skills), general education development courses (i.e., courses to prepare students for New Jersey high school equivalence diplomas), and adult basic education courses.

RECOMMENDATION 25: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD ASSESS THE COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS OF THEIR COUNTIES AND PROVIDE THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES IDENTIFIED.

In order to promote more effective and efficient services, the community colleges should initiate county needs analyses and develop programs and services to address the gaps in community service programming that are identified.

The community colleges should also apply their resources to the provision of services to state and federal agencies within their counties. Among the most obvious opportunities in this area would be the delivery of energy information, bilingual education programs, and economic and rural development services.

RECOMMENDATION 26: COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE THEIR EFFORTS TO MEET THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF ADULT STUDENTS IN JOB-RELATED PROGRAMS AS WELL AS OTHER EDUCATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL PURSUITS.

Although adult education is included under the term community services, the Commission singles it out as a separate function merely to underscore its growing importance. Lifelong learning is becoming more than a cliché. Mid-career changes, professional updating, short term refresher courses—these job-related needs for adult education are supplemented by adult interest in general education, recreation, and personal development. The adult market is a large one and has many aspects.

In-service Training and Staff Development

RECOMMENDATION 27: PROGRAMS OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AT EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO ENSURE THAT THE SKILLS OF FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF ARE UPGRADED REGULARLY, AND THAT THE IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT IS RECOGNIZED.

Academic excellence at the community colleges depends primarily on the strength and dedication of their faculties and administrators. While, to some degree, this is the case at all institutions, it is especially true in the two-year college where the emphasis is on instruction and delivery of services—not publishing and research. The promotion of educational excellence is the end purpose of the Commission's inquiry into the mission, financing, and governance of the community colleges.

Several characteristics of the community colleges point to the importance of full-scale development programs.

The specialized nature and purpose of occupational courses have required county colleges to employ instructors who have demonstrated expertise in course subject matter. Instructors are generally experts in their field and many are former entrepreneurs or employees of organizations in business, manufacturing and construction, health care, or public service. In order to assure acceptable quality of community college classroom and laboratory instruction, full and part-time occupational education instructors should successfully complete a program of organized pre-service or in-service instruction in the basic methods of teaching and classroom management, among other areas of study.

Remediation is a unique field, and ought not be left to junior faculty members or volunteers. Special training in the teaching and counseling of low-achieving students is of critical importance to the effectiveness of these programs.

Tenured faculty represent a significant proportion of the instructional personnel at the community colleges (70%). It is essential that these individuals be afforded the opportunity to renew themselves with colleagues both within and outside of the community college sector. The Mid-Career Fellowship Program, a cooperative staff development effort of Princeton University and the community colleges, is a fine example of this sort of opportunity, and we would endorse further availability of such programs.

The institutions must make a substantial commitment to the goal of staff development in terms of time for participation and funds to develop, implement, and evaluate the programs. The State's responsibility to ensure the quality of community college faculty and administrators must be made more evident through the contribution of a share of the funding.

Background

Current Governance Patterns

In New Jersey the community colleges, while under the general jurisdiction of the State Board of Higher Education, are relatively autonomous institutions established and partly financed through the county governments.

The County College Act of 1962 authorized one or more contiguous counties to establish a county college. Each college is to be governed by an autonomous nine member trustee board consisting of eight persons who are appointed by the director of the county board of chosen freeholders, and the county superintendent of schools. All but the county superintendent are to serve staggered four year terms. The trustees are given a broad range of authority and are relatively independent. (N.J.S.A. 18A:64A-1 *et seq.*) Fifteen counties have used this model to establish colleges.

The County College Act also permitted counties to provide financial support to local junior colleges already in operation. A 1968 amendment to this law enabled counties providing money to junior colleges to organize county-based college systems to provide college level programs by contracting with existing services, including those junior colleges, through a "Coordinating Agency for Higher Education." (N.J.S.A. 18A:64B-5 *et seq.*) The Agency is to be composed of two representatives of each county-assisted junior college, each Area Vocational School and four residents of the county not associated with the above institutions. (The number of public members was increased to six in 1978.) These individuals are appointed by the freeholder director and serve along with the county superintendent, as a trustee board. To date, one such agency has been founded.

In 1974, those counties which had not established county colleges were permitted to contract the service of other postsecondary institutions in the county to offer programs of instruction similar to those offered at a county college through a "Community College Commission" (N.J.S.A. 18A:64A-30 *et seq.*). The Commission is to include one representative of each accredited college—public or private, two or four year—in the county; one representative of the county vocational technical school board; four public members and the county superintendent of schools. Except for the county superintendent of schools, all appointments are to be made by the director of the board of chosen freeholders. One community college commission is currently in operation.

All three governance arrangements recognize the financial contributions of the counties and the strong tradition of local control in authorizing the freeholders in each county to appoint and remove eight of the nine members of the trustee boards. In addition, the freeholders hold a majority of seats on the Board of School Estimate, the body that reviews the budgets of the colleges.

Although the Commission makes several recommendations regarding the state, county, and college relationships, the Commission commends the counties for their outstanding effort and commitment to the colleges. We believe that the community colleges are one of the strongest assets in New Jersey's system of public postsecondary education.

Principles of Governance

An effective governance structure, designed to reflect and balance the interests of the county, the faculty, the students, and the general community, should include the following principles of governance:

- *Diversity*—The composition of the community college boards of trustees should reflect the diversity of the community served (e.g., in political, demographic, and economic terms) as well as the diversity of expertise needed by the board (e.g., skills in management, finance,

human relations). This means that there should be changes in membership parallel to the dynamics of the community.

- *Equitable Governance*—Technical assistance to the New Jersey community colleges is provided by the State, while financial support comes from the state, the county, and the student. It is sound practice fiscally and politically to include input from each major source of assistance in the governing of the institution, as the concerns and resources of each sector are vastly different.
- *A Balance of Power*—The administrative pattern for the community colleges should closely correspond to the governance doctrine established by the state legislature—a system of checks and balances of authority. This doctrine has been effectuated in the County College Act through the establishment of the colleges by county government, administration under local, politically autonomous governing boards, and oversight by the State Board of Higher Education.
- *Independence from Political Interference*—The boards of trustees should not be subject to undue influence by elected officials, college employees, or other political forces.
- *Broad Participation in Planning and Administration*—Although governance is the responsibility of the board of trustees, rational planning, managerial efficiency, and academic tradition dictate that most functions should be open to contributions from specific members of the academic community. The major participants should have primary responsibility for the following broad areas:

Board of Trustees: The promulgation and evaluation of all educational and administrative policies and programs;

Administration: The implementation of trustee policy, advising the trustees;

Faculty: Contribution to design of the academic curriculum and procedures.

Broad participation is especially important when considering that governing boards now confront such complex problems as inflation, declining enrollments, and increasing state and federal regulation.

Composition and Appointment of Community College Boards of Trustees

To fully explore the appointment procedures and structure of the community college governing boards and their impact on college operations, the Commission retained the services of the Bureau of Government Research at Rutgers University to analyze the relationship among trustees, county freeholders, and other political leaders. Also, the Commission staff collected data on the composition of trustee boards and conducted a study of trustee perceptions of community college board activities. These three studies appear as appendices to this report.

The results of this research indicate that there are many desirable elements present in the current appointment process. The Bureau has indicated, for example, that the present system has brought to the county college trustee boards many distinguished, hard-working individuals. Commission survey data indicate that trustees themselves feel that the current process is relatively effective in bringing qualified individuals to their boards.

The Bureau has noted, however, that there are also certain flaws and problems in the community college governing structure that might be detrimental if not corrected. After a comprehensive series of interviews, the Bureau concluded that, at some of the county colleges, the board of trustees is no longer acting as an effective buffer between the county political structure and the college. The erosion of this barrier has resulted in some politically inspired difficulties in personnel and academic areas—areas where external politics most certainly do not belong. According to the Bureau's report, these problems may be caused by a gradual trend in a few counties toward partisanship as the basis for trustee appointment.

Commission staff research also indicates that there has been a lack of adherence to the principle

of diversity in board composition in political, economic, and demographic terms. There is, finally, some evidence that highly skilled individuals with experiences or characteristics of value to the colleges have not been recruited for board service in some counties.

The survey on community college trustee board composition indicates that women number fewer than one-fifth (19%) of all trustees. This figure is slightly lower than the national average for public two-year colleges. Women make up a majority of the student enrollment at all but one of the New Jersey community colleges, an average of 56% across the system.

Minority students represent about 16% of total community college enrollment (Blacks 12.4%, Hispanics 3.2%), including vast majorities at two of the colleges. The proportion of minority trustees is 13% (Blacks 11.4%, Hispanics 1.6%).

More than 56% of the trustees are over 50 years old and fewer than 10% are under 30. An examination of trustee incomes indicates that 42% of the trustees earn more than \$41,000 annually, while 16% had annual incomes of \$20,000 and under.

The primary occupations of the trustees are as follows: Business, 32.6%; Education, 25.4%; Professional (physician, attorney, clergy), 16.6%; Public Service (elected official or government employee), 6.0%; Other (homemaker, retired), 25.4%.

The Commission believes that many of these inadequacies can be corrected through a few changes in the organization and structure of the boards. The proposed actions are designed to strengthen the county colleges through a solidification of the partnership between the state and the county, without compromising the integrity and autonomy of the boards of trustees.

RECOMMENDATION 28: APPOINTMENTS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE BOARDS SHOULD REFLECT THE DIVERSITY OF EXPERTISE NEEDED BY THE BOARD AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COLLEGE AND THE COUNTY IN WHICH THEY ARE LOCATED.

There are very few regulatory and legal criteria for appointing community college trustees. The Administrative Code says that the trustees should be broadly representative of the counties which they serve. The law requires that trustees be residents of the county appointing them for four years prior to appointment.

Trustee appointment guidelines adopted by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education further specify broad representation: members of the boards of trustees should be representatives of the broad public interest. They should be individuals who have demonstrated leadership in public affairs, have distinguished themselves in some field of endeavor, in either the public or private sector, and have an interest in higher education and the commitment to serve in a board role. Appointments should reflect a balance of age, sex, occupations, interests, and racial background, as the existence of various points of view will assist the colleges in carrying out their institutional missions. (*Trusteeship in the State Colleges*, N. J. Board of Higher Education, 1978)

Current appointment regulations focus much attention on demographic characteristics of trustee boards, while not speaking to the qualifications of trustees. While the Commission endorses the policies, we feel that, due to the trustee board's increasing responsibility for the college in a time of financial restrictions and declining enrollments, it is important that the New Jersey community colleges have trustee boards which possess the legal, financial, managerial, and human relations skills needed to effectively exercise their powers.

The following is a list of qualities which we feel represent some of the skills needed for a board that can effectively serve the college. These are not specific quotas or standards, nor are they criteria to be met by every member of every board. The Commission believes that the qualities are consonant with Board of Higher Education policy and should be incorporated into the Administrative Code. At the same time, individuals selected as trustees should be free from direct political involvement or influence, and in occupations unrelated to county or state fiduciary responsibility.

Qualities to Be Represented Within a Community College Board of Trustees

1. Broad knowledge of traditions, practices, and trends in higher education (such as academic freedom) and an understanding of the issues and problems confronting its future
2. Background in corporate or governmental planning
3. Familiarity with contemporary corporate accounting and auditing practices
4. Experience related to developing and evaluating personnel policies and procedures, including contract negotiations
5. Successful fund raising for charitable and nonprofit organizations
6. Distinguished service as a volunteer for a nonprofit agency
7. Experience in an administrative or supervisory capacity in human resource training and development
8. Graduate of the college
9. Employment in a capacity within the county which provides considerable contact with a geographically and ethnically diverse population
10. Experience in physical planning and construction
11. Orientation in an area of financial responsibility, such as banking
12. Successful operation of a small business enterprise
13. Legal training and experience
14. Student of the college

RECOMMENDATION 29: THE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS SHOULD NO LONGER BE A MANDATED MEMBER OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE BOARDS.

The presence of the county superintendent on the boards of each community college is a vestige of the state authority formerly held by the Department of Education.

When the community colleges were founded, they were under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. As an employee of the Department, the county superintendent represented the Commissioner on the local college boards. Since 1967, when the Department of Higher Education was created, the Chancellor has been the state official responsible for the community colleges.

While the county superintendent was also a member of the board to ensure coordination between secondary and postsecondary studies, and the need for such coordination still exists, the community colleges are now recognized as providers of college level instruction and services, and not extensions of the secondary schools. In addition, the community colleges increasingly serve older students whose articulation problems are quite different from those of recent high school graduates.

Some county superintendents have been effective members of trustee boards. It is apparent, however, that the individual rather than the office is the fundamental source of guidance. Legislation removing the county superintendent as a mandated member of county college boards should not be construed as discouraging freeholders from continuing to appoint the county superintendent to trustee boards where the individual might add to the board's effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION 30: ALL ELECTED GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SHOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM SERVING AS TRUSTEES.

New Jersey law prohibits county freeholders from holding positions on boards that they appoint, and from holding such appointments for three months after leaving office (N.J.S.A. 40A:9-23). The Commission believes that it is appropriate for this prohibition to be extended to all elected officials other than local school board members, since direct college governance should be separate from politics. Although the practice of placing elected officials on trustee

boards is not widespread, it has happened on several occasions. We believe that such a practice should not be permitted.

First of all, there is the possible danger that such individuals could be used as political conduits between the county government and the college administration. It is not necessary for the freeholders to have any political affiliate serving as a trustee. The County College Act has given the freeholders ample oversight of the colleges through their right of appointment and removal of trustees, and budgetary review through the Board of School Estimate. Secondly, it is the Commission's view that there are many highly qualified individuals, not subject to political constraints, available to serve as trustees.

RECOMMENDATION 31: NO INDIVIDUAL SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO SERVE AS A TRUSTEE AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE WHERE HE OR SHE IS EMPLOYED.

The Commission believes that, as a matter of principle, no specific constituency should be represented on the board of trustees. Employees of a college would be placed in a position of conflicting interests as trustees, since terms, salaries, and conditions of employment are determined by the trustees.

It is recommended, therefore, that the community college statutes be amended to prohibit employees of a college from serving on the board of trustees of that college.

RECOMMENDATION 32: THE PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE SHOULD SERVE AS A TRUSTEE, EX OFFICIO, WITHOUT VOTE.

Under the County College Act (18A:64A-12e), "the president is to serve as a trustee, *ex officio*." The Commission asks that the law be amended to read "*ex officio*, without vote." While the president is the chief executive of the college, he or she is also an employee of the college whose appointment, term of office, and salary are a major responsibility of the board of trustees. This recommendation is designed to clarify the distinction between the trustees as the governors and the president as the chief administrator of a college.

RECOMMENDATION 33: THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD BE AUTHORIZED TO APPOINT TWO OF THE NINE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE TRUSTEE BOARDS AT EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

There are few institutions receiving substantial state financial support that have the freedom from direct state supervision enjoyed by the county colleges. This recommendation is designed to establish a balance between the State, the county, and the college and to acknowledge the Board of Higher Education's role in the operation of the community colleges.

The State Board of Higher Education supervises certain portions of community college operations. Among them are licensure, program review, and financial audit. The Board also provides substantial revenues and technical support to the community colleges. The Board, however, is not involved in the governance of these institutions. This is not consistent with the principle of equitable governance.

This recommendation is also based on the findings of the Bureau of Government Research, which concluded that the current appointment process is biased toward the county and has been used in some cases for political manipulation. This violates the principle of balance of power.

The Bureau's research has concluded that limiting the State Board to two appointments is appropriate. Community colleges are local institutions in name and through the large burden of local tax and tuition support, so two trustees will sufficiently acknowledge the state's role. One appointment would be a mere token of the state's role while three or more might exert too much influence.

To implement this recommendation, the boards would not be expanded, and the freeholders would continue to appoint a decided majority of the trustees. Like all other trustees, the two

trustees appointed by the Board of Higher Education would serve staggered terms and would be required to reside in the county of the college that they will serve. This caveat acknowledges that colleges are local institutions designed to meet local needs and that county residents best understand those needs.

The state appointed trustees should act informally as the liaison between the local board and the State Board. They would, for example, be responsible for introducing a statewide perspective to a local issue. State appointed trustees would not be "the representatives" of the Board of Higher Education. No college trustee should ever represent any constituency. Nor should the two state appointed trustees be regarded by freeholder appointed trustees as adversaries. They should be strongly independent and willing to act as a buffer between the college and all external political forces. In light of the increases in state monitoring and technical support proposed by the Commission, the two state appointed trustees may, in fact, serve as the bulwark against strict state control.

RECOMMENDATION 34: COUNTY-BASED SEARCH COMMITTEES SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE PURPOSE OF NOMINATING TRUSTEE CANDIDATES TO TRUSTEE APPOINTING AUTHORITIES.

The Commission recommends that every county which finances a community college establish a search committee to recruit, evaluate, and recommend candidates to the freeholders and/or county executives for appointment to community college trustee boards. This is to be a standing committee, appointed by the freeholders (or the county executive, with the approval of the freeholders). The Board of Higher Education should likewise establish a comparable search committee to nominate candidates for the two appointments made by the Board.

The membership of both committees should include prominent and respected county residents who occupy leadership positions in such areas as higher education, business, organized labor, service and civic-oriented organizations, and women's and minority access associations, among many others.

Trustee candidates should be selected on the basis of the general guidelines recommended earlier. The search committees, in general, should use the approved mission statement of the college to identify individuals whose background, experience, education, interest, and character would closely fulfill the numerous responsibilities of a community college trustee. It should be the obligation of the county planning office to provide the search committees with data describing the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of the relevant counties.

The committee should present a list of not more than ten names for each vacancy to the freeholders/county executives or Board of Higher Education. The respective appointing agencies may use this list at their option, but in any case, must be responsible for making the final selection. No member of any search committee should be eligible to be nominated as a candidate or to accept appointment as a trustee. Former search committee members should not be eligible to serve as trustees for a period of six months following their resignation from the committee.

Work on a search committee should not impose great time constraints on any members since trustees serve staggered terms, and thus only two vacancies occur in any given year.

It must be emphasized that a committee is not a proxy for the freeholders or Board of Higher Education. The mechanism is designed to expose the trustee appointment process to the benefits of wide publicity and broad participation that can enhance the image of the college. At the same time, the appointing authorities are given considerable discretion and latitude in the actual selection of trustees.

RECOMMENDATION 35: THE LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING THE HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING AGENCY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMISSION MODELS SHOULD BE REVISED SO THAT THE APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES AND COMPOSITION OF THEIR TRUSTEE BOARDS PARALLEL THOSE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

The report by the Bureau of Government Research suggests that commission and agency college arrangements are weakened in their ability to provide services because the proceedings of the trustee boards are strongly influenced by representatives of the participating institutions. Furthermore, the Commission believes, in principle, that no trustee should represent any agency or constituency. The current Commission and agency statutes allow representatives of participating institutions and possibly even employees of these institutions to serve on the trustee boards.

It is recommended, therefore, that statutes pertaining to coordinating agencies and community college commissions be amended to change those boards to nine public members appointed by the freeholders and Board of Higher Education, parallel to the boards of regular county colleges.

RECOMMENDATION 36: FINAL AUTHORITY FOR PLANNING, POLICY, AND EVALUATION IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, BUT THE PLANNING PROCESS AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE OPEN TO ALL CONSTITUENTS (E.G. FACULTY, STUDENTS, STAFF, ADMINISTRATION).

The boards of trustees are ultimately accountable for all facets of college operations. The responsibilities of the boards should, however, be assigned or delegated in a manner that the board sees as effective and desirable. In light of the vast array of responsibilities of the board, it is vital that the formulation and execution of most fiscal, personnel, and planning policies are assigned to skilled administrators. It is on the basis of their expert opinion that the trustees will establish and evaluate policy. Other decision making processes, such as academic planning, should also involve contributions from many constituents.

The Commission strongly urges that processes be formulated and instituted on all campuses that will expedite the free flow of information and comment about college planning and policy from not only the administration but from faculty, students, and staff. It is especially important that the college faculty have the opportunity to make significant contributions to designing the academic curriculum and procedures, and participate in future planning for the college.

While the Commission urges that the opportunity for broad input be made available, it does not believe that these mechanisms should be imposed on the colleges by the State.

RECOMMENDATION 37: A COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE PROGRAM OF NEW TRUSTEE ORIENTATION AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED TO ENABLE TRUSTEES TO SERVE THEIR COLLEGES EFFECTIVELY.

Generally, the men and women selected to serve as trustees are highly competent individuals who have a record of accomplishment in their fields. They are certainly capable of serving as effective trustees if they are properly prepared for their roles. Yet, several studies of college trustees in various states have indicated that trustees frequently feel uncomfortable for the first several months of their tenure. In the absence of orientation and training programs, they are forced to learn how to conduct themselves as trustees through trial and error. The studies conducted by Rutgers and the Commission staff confirm that many of New Jersey's county college trustees have experienced frustration and confusion in their initial interactions with college administrators and their colleagues on the board.

Some trustees might not be sufficiently acquainted with higher education to make sound judgments in an academic context. Other trustees may accept the appointment as a matter of prestige and fail to devote appropriate time and effort to their duties. Still others may be passive and, as a result, are excluded from decision making processes by their colleagues or the admin-

istration. There is also the possibility that some trustees may become too deeply involved in the day-to-day administrative activity at the college.

If a trustee does not know how to participate effectively, this will hamper a board's effectiveness. Thus, we recommend that the Department of Higher Education initiate a comprehensive program of trustee orientation and in-service training. It should be planned and operated by the DHE in consultation with the Council of County Colleges and representatives of the college faculty, administration, and students. Programs would be provided to acquaint trustees with various areas in the operation of their college, such as contract negotiations, budgeting, and academic evaluation, as well as general information on the role of a trustee.

RECOMMENDATION 38: A COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE SHOULD NOT BE ELIGIBLE TO ACCEPT APPOINTMENT AS AN EMPLOYEE OF HIS OR HER COLLEGE FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS FOLLOWING RESIGNATION OR EXPIRATION OF TERM.

The Commission has recommended that employees of the community colleges be prohibited from serving as trustees. In the same vein, trustees should be prohibited from becoming college employees and should continue to be ineligible for appointment for two years after leaving the board.

The trustees are specifically charged with selecting the college president and are responsible for approving all appointments to the college faculty and staff. It would set a dangerous precedent if a person who was a candidate for a position was also part of the selection process. A conflict of interest is created if the candidate is not separated by time and affiliation from access to those who are making these decisions.

The Counties

RECOMMENDATION 39: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES, COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMISSIONS, AND COUNTY HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING AGENCIES SHOULD BE STATUTORILY EXEMPT FROM THE PROVISIONS OF THE OPTIONAL COUNTY CHARTER ACT.

The charge to this Commission isolated the Optional County Charter Act for particular consideration, and several speakers at the public meetings devoted their entire presentations to the topic. The Commission sought to examine objectively all relevant data before making any recommendation.

The Optional County Charter Act (PL 1972 C.154) gives New Jersey voters the right to reorganize their county governments. The goal of this legislation is to promote efficiency in the delivery of vital services by unifying county governments under one executive. Reorganized governments have now been installed in five of New Jersey's most populous counties, and several more are likely to follow. Colleges in three of those five counties have now been noticeably affected.

In Hudson County, the county government fully reorganized the county college coordinating commission trustee board, eliminating the institutional representatives who controlled all board activities. According to the findings of the Bureau of Government Research, this change may not be legal, but it has benefited the system.

In Mercer County, the planned government reorganization would have entitled the freeholders to one seat on the board of trustees and the college president would have become, in effect, an agency chief subordinate to the county executive. Before these changes were instituted, the college trustees, seeking to clarify the county-college relationship, sued the county executive and freeholder board. The Court ruled that under the terms of the Optional County Charter Act, the county had the right to make the proposed changes and incorporate the college into the county government. The trustees appealed this decision and two years later the Court held in their favor (160 NJ Super. App. Div. 1978). The community colleges, the Court said, are not "county agencies," but are "special units of government" as these terms are defined under the

Charter Law (NJSA 40:41A-28). This decision means that community colleges are not subject to the terms of that law. The basis for the Court's decision was the definition of the fundamental relationship between county government and county colleges established by the N. J. Supreme Court in a 1971 case involving Atlantic Community College (Atlantic CC vs. Civil Service Commission 59 NJ, 1971). When the county appealed, the N.J. Supreme Court, refusing to hear the case, passed jurisdiction for resolution of the issue to the state legislature. This is where the issue currently stands.

The initial actions by the government in Mercer County have most recently been repeated in Essex County. The first elected county executive has announced that he might absorb the college into the newly reorganized county governmental structure and he attempted to appoint a freeholder to the board of trustees.

The Commission weighed a great deal of evidence, but in light of the inability of any author or speaker to definitively separate educational and non-educational functions, the public testimony about political problems, and the findings of the Rutgers study, the Commission concludes that education is an extraordinary function and should be considered a very specialized segment of public trust, and thus not subject to many of the restrictions placed on governmental agencies.

We therefore recommend that the legislature move with great haste to pass legislation excluding the community colleges from the terms of the Optional County Charter Act.

RECOMMENDATION 40: THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAS SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR INTERVENING IN THE OPERATIONS OF A COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

The Commission endorses the visitation rights provision of New Jersey statutes which gives the Board of Higher Education the exclusive right to review the licensure and operations of a community college. A county government should not intervene in the operation of a community college. County freeholder boards have ample opportunity to review county college operations through Boards of School Estimate, public hearings, and appointment of trustees. If issues of poor operations (e.g., gross political interference, academic failure, financial mismanagement) should arise, the freeholders may request Board of Higher Education intervention through the Chancellor.

RECOMMENDATION 41: THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD SERVE AS A RESOURCE TO THE BOARDS OF SCHOOL ESTIMATE IN THEIR REVIEW OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUDGETS.

Boards of School Estimate consist of three freeholders and two community college trustees. They are responsible for reviewing college budgets and establishing the county appropriation.

The Board of School Estimate is the major vehicle by which the counties supervise and review the budgets of their community colleges. We believe that the Department of Higher Education should provide information on budgetary processes, comparative cost data, FTE costs, and other related issues for the Board's consideration. A representative of the Department should be required to attend Board of School Estimate sessions for this purpose.

Statutory/Regulatory Review

RECOMMENDATION 42: THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD REVIEW THE CURRENT LAW GOVERNING THE RIGHTS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS TO DETERMINE WHETHER IT SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH SEPARATE LEGISLATION SPECIFIC TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SECTOR.

The New Jersey county college law grants college faculty and administrators all rights and privileges of teachers employed by local boards of education (NJSA 18A:64A-13).

Since the founding of the first community colleges in 1966, there have been several occasions where this provision has imposed constraints on the ability of the colleges and their faculty to make contracts. It has affected issues such as length of service prior to tenure, holidays, and notification date for termination of services.

There have been several instances where the state legislature has passed exemptions for the community colleges. This, however, is not a solution but a reflection of the problem of attempting to apply a law designed for public schools to community colleges.

These provisions are another vestige of the notion that community colleges are upward extensions of secondary schools. The current view of community colleges as postsecondary institutions should be reflected in the legislation governing the colleges. However, the issue is much too complex for a simple recommendation to repeal the existing law. It will be necessary to conduct a thorough and intensive study to determine the full extent of the effects of this statute and identify the implications of changing the law. We see the Department of Higher Education as the appropriate entity to conduct such a study.

RECOMMENDATION 43: A REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS FOR NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE CONDUCTED.

The New Jersey Administrative Code for county colleges is promulgated by the Board of Higher Education. It contains the rules for those areas of community college operations which are under the Board's jurisdiction. Since the revision of the *Regulations and Standards* there have been several changes in the nature of community college operations (e.g., collective bargaining). This Commission has recommended several changes that will be required in areas such as chargeback, faculty participation in planning, and trustee characteristics. It is important, therefore, that the code be subject to intensive review and possible revision.

The Board of Higher Education should commission a complete review of the regulations at the earliest possible time.

Council of County Colleges

RECOMMENDATION 44: THE COUNCIL OF COUNTY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE TO SERVE AS AN ADVISORY BODY, AND EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE TO ENHANCE ITS EFFECTIVENESS.

The Council of County Colleges was created in 1966 to act in an advisory capacity to the Board of Higher Education. The Council consists of the president and trustee chairperson of each community college and plays a critical role in the development of policy for the two-year sector.

Because of the increased importance of cooperation and communication within and among the sectors of postsecondary education, we believe that a study should be conducted to identify ways in which the Council can be enhanced or improved.

The Commission believes that staff support is necessary to the effective functioning of the Council, and would recommend that the present staffing arrangement with the Department of Higher Education be continued.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE FINANCING OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Background

Throughout this report, the Commission has emphasized several priorities which, in our view, are fundamental to the future of the community college system in New Jersey. In the main, these priorities concern the expansion of educational opportunity beyond high school by eliminating physical, administrative, and financial barriers to open access. We have also recommended the development of a new partnership between the State and the county governments through state representation by local citizens on community college boards of trustees as well as new safeguards in the public interest concerning membership on these bodies.

The finance recommendations which follow support the direction and intent of statements set forth in the Mission and Governance sections of this report. The Commission believes that a sound financial underpinning is essential if the momentum for growth in the quality and breadth of offerings is to continue to be responsive to the needs of the community residents and the longer range interests of the state.

The primary strength of the current funding mechanism is its simplicity of operation. Boards of School Estimate, institutions, and local freeholders can reasonably calculate total state support for operations based upon the current \$700 per FTE formula. Secondly, with minor exceptions, the legislated amount of support has been routinely forwarded each year so that colleges have not been in the position of waiting an inordinate amount of time to receive their portion of state support. By comparison, institutions in other states have waited for funding up to a year because of legislative difficulties, forcing them to borrow money against expected state aid and creating the additional burden of expense to cover debt service.

The Commission identified four drawbacks to the present funding approach:

1. It is not equitable with regard to other sectors of public higher education;
2. it is primarily an enrollment driven system;
3. it does not systematically provide for inflationary increases in state support; and
4. it does not recognize program cost differences.

The Commission believes that the deficiencies cited above outweigh the benefits of the present system; these provided the focus for the Commission's deliberations on finance.

The major thrust of our recommendations is the nature of the distribution of support to New Jersey community colleges. We believe that stable and declining enrollments call for a major shift in the underlying rationale of the funding mechanism from one which is enrollment driven to one which recognizes the fixed nature of many of the costs of operating a college and acknowledges the differing costs of the educational programs. Also addressed in the proposed funding mechanism is an equitable and uniform process for relating annual increases in state aid to the community college sector to that of other sectors of higher education. Additionally the Commission believes that the viability of open access requires the maintenance of low tuition levels, financial aid to part-time students, and fair and effective chargeback arrangements between counties.

The principle of equalization, while certainly important to the topic of community college finance, is not addressed specifically in this report, as more research and study are required before sound conclusions can be reached. The tax effort made by counties does not appear to be directly related to their "ability" to spend money on county colleges; however, valid determination of county "ability" is a controversial and highly complex issue. Little empirical research has been conducted, nationally, that indicates either the extent to which differences in the ability of counties to provide financial support exist or the extent to which state aid to county colleges compensates for such differences. Because there is neither a clear court mandate nor an adequate methodology to make determinations regarding the wealth of the counties, the Commission has chosen to defer this issue to the Department of Higher Education for further study.

Distribution of State Support for Community Colleges

Categorical Funding

Because of the enrollment decline indicated by demographic projections and the need to protect the quality of service and the investment in facilities at the community colleges, the Commission believes that a significant portion of state funding should not be enrollment driven. This aspect of the present funding mechanism (which results in a fixed amount per student FTE) ignores those items which are not affected by enrollment variation. The State's general funding mechanism should be modified such that the State provides an established share of the funds necessary to support these activities.

RECOMMENDATION 45: THE STATE SHOULD CATEGORICALLY FUND: THOSE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS IMPOSED ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY FEDERAL AND STATE STATUTES, MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES, AND OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE TO THE STATE.

We conclude that there are two basic areas of categorical support that must be provided in this way: ongoing operation and maintenance costs and special programs of major importance to the State. By designating state aid in this way, the Commission stipulates that the funds must be protected so that they are used only for the purposes defined by the respective categories. That is, no person or group administering the disbursement of these funds may transfer amounts among categories. Under this guideline the Commission recommends that, at a minimum, the following items receive categorical funding:

1. *Staff Development*—The Commission recommends that the State provide needed leadership through the support of staff development programs for county college faculty, administration, and staff. As an incentive, the state should fund institutional programs which are operating or to be developed at \$500 per institution plus \$200 per full-time faculty and administrative staff member. The Commission strongly encourages the colleges to develop training programs for all employees. The state should provide the funding necessary as these programs are established.
2. *Institutional Planning and Research*—The need for better, more complete information about current and future activities of the community colleges requires adequate staff and financial support. This is not only important for the respective institutions but is in the State's interest as well. As the Office of Community College Programs of the Department of Higher Education increases its need for information, it can only be as successful as the respective community college responses are timely and complete. It is for this reason that the State must recognize the need for effective planning and research in the respective institutions as a high priority. The Commission recommends an initial and, thereafter, continuing grant of \$20,000 per institution as the State's share of the cost.
3. *Program Development and Special Projects*—The Commission believes that the State's funding mechanism must provide for certain technical/occupational education programs to meet selective manpower demands of industry throughout the state. Such projects and programs may be proposed by any of the respective institutions or initiated at the state level because of their considered priority. In these instances, the Commission recommends that the Office of Community College Programs invite proposals by the colleges (on a regional basis, where appropriate) for these training programs, and, upon acceptance, the State should categorically fund the proposals selected. Such categorical funding would include capital as well as operating costs for living arrangements and/or transportation, if determined appropriate and necessary for the success of the needed program.
4. *Plant Operations and Maintenance*—The Commission recommends support for this item at the rate of \$2.00 per internal gross square foot, which follows the current practice with regard to state colleges (\$2.50 square foot). Included in this amount are custodial support and security, ground care, utilities, and college vehicles.
5. *Mandated Payroll Cost Factors*—The community college system does not presently share in the direct support by the State as do other sectors for such mandated obligations as the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS), FICA, Unemployment Insurance, and Workman's Compensation. To minimize impact on community college budgets, the Commission recommends that the State support these costs in the same manner and to the same extent as is done for other sectors.
6. *Compliance with Section 503, 504 Regulations*—Federal regulations of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 require that all educational programs and institutions receiving federal assistance be accessible to the handicapped. While all community colleges will be affected, some will require extensive program and facility modifications to meet these new standards. To ensure

that the services are provided in a timely and adequate manner, the state should categorically fund these necessary expenditures imposed on the institutions by federal and state statutes. Further, it is the recommendation of the Commission that the Department of Higher Education explore the feasibility of establishing regional programs for certain handicapped individuals. Opportunities of this sort are addressed by the principle of regionalization of high cost, low enrollment special programs.

Differential Funding

The comprehensive community college curriculum includes technical programs as well as other career and liberal arts programs; this results in significant variations in program costs due to differences in enrollment patterns, faculty-student ratios, and the type and costs of equipment, facilities, and instructional aids. Unfortunately, the current method of distributing aid to the community colleges does not take these distinctions into account. As a result, there is a direct financial disincentive for institutions to undertake high cost career and occupational programs that are of priority interest to the local communities and to the State. Colleges are therefore left with the choice of establishing and continuing these important programs only if they are able to pay the full additional cost.

RECOMMENDATION 46: STATE AID AMONG THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE PROVIDED SO THAT DIFFERENCES IN PROGRAM COSTS ARE RECOGNIZED (DIFFERENTIAL FUNDING).

The Commission recommends that, as state support for the community college system is established, funds be differentially disbursed based on an average of program costs described below. To implement this differential funding mechanism, the Department of Higher Education must first group new and existing courses or programs into a limited number of categories. These categories might be the following: General Academic, Occupational/Technical, Remedial/Developmental (credit and non-credit), and Fundable Non-Credit Courses. The Department should then conduct an annual cost analysis of sector expense for these categories based on actual audited cost per FTE for the previous fiscal year to establish an average state-wide ratio of costs. These ratios would be applied in a distribution formula using the derived per FTE dollar amount in the funding of each community college that would be weighted by the audited FTE for each program category for the then current year.

Non-program categories qualifying for differential aid could also be considered, such as handicapped students, or other special groups of students having specified needs.

It should be noted that, with the increased number of colleges using NCHEMS RRPM* 1.6 Program Cost Model, comparable program cost data will soon be available for the first time. When this practice is extended to all colleges, the state as well as the community colleges will have in place an important financial planning tool. The implementation of the Categorical and Differential distribution model need not wait for complete institution of the NCHEMS program cost model. There is already a sufficient number of institutions in the community college system that have this procedure in place and operating to provide adequate data for cost ratio analysis. For those institutions not using the NCHEMS accounting model, the existence of differential funding generated from this method will provide an added incentive for its development.

While the primary purpose of differential funding is to reflect accurately and to support appropriately programs of differing cost, there is a second benefit for the State as well. Through differential funding, the State is in a position to provide continuous incentives for colleges to explore and develop highly technical and vocational programs that colleges would not otherwise be able to offer. These incentives must, however, be of such a magnitude as to have the desired effect.

*National Center for Higher Education Management Statistics
Resource Requirement Prediction Model

Categorical and Differential Funding Illustration

To illustrate the differential funding recommendation and how it establishes a recommended level for total state support, the Commission presents the following example. While it contains some verifiable data, we wish to emphasize that it is purely illustrative and not authoritative because other actual data were unavailable. In particular, campus-by-campus data showing the impact of differential and categorical funding do not appear due to the general lack of state-wide accumulated financial data. This situation must be rectified if planning, particularly financial planning, is to occur.

If the community college system operating expense for FY 1977-78 was \$125,622,000 and if state support was at a satisfactory level, categorical aid for continuity purposes in this example would be the following:

Staff Development-\$500 per institution plus \$200 per professional employee	\$ 690,000
Institutional Planning and Research- \$20,000 per institution	\$ 340,000
Program Development and Special Projects	\$ 500,000
Plant Operations and Maintenance 5,400,000 sq. ft. at \$2.00	\$10,800,000
Mandated Payroll Cost Factors-50% of cost estimated at 10% of total expenditures	<u>\$ 6,500,000</u>
Total General and Education System-wide Categorical Support	\$18,830,000

To determine the State's share of differential or student-based support, assume that, as a result of an annual sector-wide cost analysis and FTE study, the Department of Higher Education found the following information:

Instructional Category	Percent of Population	FTE Student	Estimated Cost Ratio
General Academic	44	30,140	1.0
Occupational/Technical	30	20,550	1.5
Remedial/Developmental	20	13,700	1.5
Non-Credit Courses	<u>6</u>	<u>4,110</u>	0.5
	100%	68,500	

With this information at hand, the Department applies an established dollar differential among categories which is of sufficient magnitude to be an incentive for institutions to adjust curricular policies to receive increased aid. This example assumes that there must be a \$250 difference between categories, which the Commission believes to be a minimum differential although, in actual practice, the difference between categories may be greater than this amount. The amount of student-based state support is then calculated:

Instructional Category	Estimated Cost Ratio	Per FTE Differential Support	FTE	Total Differential Support
General Academic	1.0	\$500	30,140	\$15,070,000
Occupational/Technical	1.5	750	20,550	15,412,500
Remedial/Developmental	1.5	750	13,700	10,275,000
Non-Credit Courses	0.5	250	4,110	<u>1,027,500</u>
Total Student-Based Support through Differential Funding				\$41,785,000

The total state share of financial support would then be the following:

Categorical	\$18,830,000
Differential	<u>41,785,000</u>
Total Support	\$60,615,000

While the State's share in this example is \$12.7 million above the \$47.9 million state support normally given for 68,500 FTE (10.9 million if an adjusted \$726/FTE including minor capital aid is used), it has provided adequate non-enrollment driven categorical support for facilities, mandated payroll cost factors, and special programs, plus meaningful incentives for curricular change. While care must be taken to assure that, during an acceptable transition period no institution is penalized for previous curricular decisions, distribution to the respective institutions based on audited FTE data would follow the same procedure.

Although the differential funding arrangement described above should direct the state distribution of support, the county share of funding would continue as it has in the past based on appropriate New Jersey statutes and on budgetary review by the Board of School Estimate.

Cost Containment

The creation of average program costs across community colleges will provide a standard (to be adjusted annually) for desirable spending levels. With state distribution of its funds based on these standards, institutions will have an important incentive to keep costs below these established amounts so that they may redistribute the realized savings to other programs to improve their quality. While the State should not wish to monitor spending at the respective institutions (thereby usurping the responsibility of freeholders and Boards of School Estimate), it can contribute to this process by providing comparative cost data to freeholders, institutional leaders, and trustees. The cumulative effect from the State's point of view will be the tempering of cost increases over time due to better financial information shared with decision makers.

Annual Funding Adjustment

Under the current funding arrangement, the community college system is treated as a separate entity from the rest of the postsecondary education sectors. That is, increases in state aid to the community college system are either enrollment driven or result from separate funding legislation submitted by state legislators. The result is an unpredictable process for securing increased support. What is needed is a mechanism for increasing state aid which is automatic and regular in its operation so as to allow the receiving institutions and support agencies to plan rationally and to ensure that the continuing responsibility of the State to share in the expense of inflation and other increased costs is met with a minimum of intervening budgetary legislation.

RECOMMENDATION 47: THE STATE FINANCE PLAN FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD PROVIDE FOR ANNUAL FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS AT THE SAME RATE PER FTE STUDENT AS FTE AID TO OTHER SECTORS IS CHANGED.

By establishing annual funding adjustments at a rate equal to that granted to other state supported sectors of postsecondary education, particularly the state colleges, the State will achieve a more neutral financial policy, and a more coordinated financial plan. Full participation in the current system of state aid to the public state colleges, university, and professional schools must be achieved early to protect previous state investments in the community college sector and to maintain and extend the quality education now offered by the community colleges. It should be noted that, in comparison with other relevant sectors, the increase adjustment for the community colleges represents fewer absolute dollars, as they receive only a portion of their funding from the State.

The Commission and the community college sector cannot ignore the economic realities and uncertainties associated with future state appropriations for higher education. Clearly, the community college system must share in the resulting burdens of future fiscal stringencies brought about when appropriations do not keep pace with inflation and legitimate need. Should this occur, the Commission believes that the level of reduced support should be reflected in reduced funding per FTE (student based differential funding) rather than in artificial reduction in recognized FTE calculations.

This arrangement represents a change from the State's previous practice of funding fewer than

the number of audited FTEs than actually exist, and is consistent with the principle of parity with other sectors. It also provides a more accountable method to the public for reviewing community college support over the years. For example, it is not immediately clear to the public that although the State continued to support the community colleges at the then current rate of \$600 per FTE in FY 76 and FY 77, there were actually 28% and 19% more students enrolled than were funded in each of those years, respectively. The Commission believes that any future variation in state support should be presented in clear relief by adjusting the level of FTE differential support, rather than funding fewer FTEs than is actually the case.

Level of State Support for Community Colleges

The Commission believes that the principle of joint funding of the community college system by state and county governments has contributed to the strength and continued viability of this sector of postsecondary education. This partnership was formalized when funding legislation in 1966 declared the following:

The board of higher education shall formulate annual budget requests for state support of county colleges. Within the limits of funds appropriated to the board of higher education for such purpose and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the board of higher education, the board of trustees of a county college may apply to the board of higher education and receive state support:

- a. For capital projects approved by the board of higher education in amounts not to exceed one half of the costs of said capital projects, and
- b. For operational costs to the extent of one half thereof or \$600.00 per equated full-time student, including such students resident in other counties, whichever is the lesser amount.

State support for the operational costs of county colleges shall be made within limits of state appropriation and only after an annual review and approval by the board of higher education of the financial program for operation of the county college, including the charges to be made for student tuition and fees and the establishment of the county share of said costs. (N.J.S.A. 18 A:64A-22)

Although public testimony to the Commission indicated a widespread belief that the State commitment was to support the community college system at the level of 50% of budgeted expenses, the Commission as a whole does not share this view. It should be noted, however, that several members of the Commission argued vigorously for a 50% goal. Despite efforts to confirm this perception, no legally binding documentation of such a commitment was located or produced by proponents or others on the Commission. Indeed, it is the judgment of the Commission that the initial allocation of 50% or \$600 per FTE with no provision for the \$600 to rise with increased costs belies this widely held belief. The Commission, therefore, considers the reference to 50% as a "cap" on support rather than a goal for state funding. Table 3 below illustrates that this figure of 50% has never been met.

While total state aid has risen as enrollments have grown, state support as a percent of operating costs has declined. This perhaps unintended consequence was rectified to a degree in FY 1978 when, by amendatory legislation, the fixed unit of state support was increased from \$600 to \$700 per FTE. This increase, however, will not have a lasting impact because of escalating inflationary costs and stable enrollments. This continuous decline in state support (other than the \$100 increase in FY 78) has forced the level of county support to climb steadily. Under this flat grant system by the State, the counties have been forced to assume increased expenses related to expanded services and the additional burden of the State's legitimate share of inflation.

Over time, tuition income has grown in absolute dollars, mostly as a result of enrollment growth and to some extent due to increased rates for tuition. On a percentage basis, the student at the community college is paying for a greater percentage of his or her education than corresponding students at Rutgers, NJIT, and the College of Medicine and Dentistry. This pressure, caused by the decline in state support, works against the commitment to open access which remains at the heart for the mission for the community colleges.

TABLE 3

Contribution of State, County, and Tuition to Total Educational and General Revenues ('000s)

	FY67	FY68	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	FY79†
Total E & G Revenues*	2,405	6,469	19,091	35,881	48,803	60,525	72,865	81,109	99,502	111,662	119,047	134,764	142,850
State	1,001	2,975	8,637	15,945	20,583	24,418	27,336	29,662	32,838	31,877	33,780	46,971	47,950
County	680	1,281	5,384	18,523	12,096	16,554	22,262	26,495	32,344	38,915	42,151	43,020	46,498‡
Tuition	703	1,930	5,315	9,689	13,741	16,961	19,502	22,776	27,740	32,756	36,825	38,076	41,426
State (%)	41.7	45.0	45.3	44.4	42.2	40.3	37.5	36.6	33.0	28.5	28.4	35.0	33.5
County (%)	28.7	22.0	28.2	23.8	24.8	27.5	30.7	32.7	32.5	34.9	35.4	32.0	32.5
Tuition (%)	29.2	29.8	27.8	27.0	28.2	28.1	26.8	28.1	28.9	29.3	30.9	28.0	29.0

†Estimated operating budget for FY79 assuming inflation increase at 6%.

‡Estimated county support required given current State support fixed at \$700/FTE and fixed tuition at \$500/student given current enrollment.

*Note: Total Educational and General Revenues were used since they were deemed to be more reliable. Operating expenses are slightly smaller because they do not include student loan funds which are real-expenses derived from Total E & G Revenues.

Accordingly, it is the view of the Commission that the current level of funding must be increased to improve and expand current offerings, to expand access to postsecondary education by keeping tuition low, and to encourage the development of services and programs of vital interest to the State as well as the local communities.

RECOMMENDATION 48: THE STATE SHOULD INCREASE ITS SUPPORT TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SECTOR OVER FIVE YEARS BY A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT TO BRING ITS SUPPORT TO A LEVEL NOT LESS THAN 43% BUT WITHIN 50% OF OPERATIONAL COSTS.

This recommendation represents an adjustment or refinement of the current understanding about the desirable level of support the State is expected to give to the community college system. While there may not be a consensus as to the exact percentage of support the State should give, the Commission unanimously believes that the past record of state support has been inadequate, placing too much of a fiscal burden on counties with corresponding pressure to increase tuition. The Commission believes that the State's responsibility for postsecondary education supports the position of a full partnership of the State with the county governments. This partnership, in the Commission's view, must mean significant financial support at a level above county support but within a 50% ceiling consistent with current legislation. While there is little independent justification for establishing either a ceiling or floor for acceptable state support, the Commission believes that for the State to be a substantial partner its support must be no less than 43%. In calculating the level of state support necessary to ensure effective implementation of the principles of categorical and differential funding, 43% was identified as the Commission's best estimation of the minimum needed. Calculations based on actual costs might result in a percentage of support higher or lower than 43%.

It is also noteworthy that the practicality of this percentage is supported by the fact that, during the first six years of operation, the average level of state support was 43.1%. State support declined substantially in the years that followed.

Implementation of Recommendation

Unfortunately, current support and the prospect for future support of the community college system by the State without significant executive and legislative intervention falls far short of this minimally acceptable level. What is needed is a mechanism for increased funding building from previous recommendations in this report that takes the following considerations into account:

1. Fiscal constraints placed upon the State are real;
2. categorical and differential funding procedures should be introduced as soon as possible;
3. there should be equitable treatment of each sector by the Board of Higher Education; and

4. each institution should not be significantly penalized financially (that is, not receive less aid than previously) because of previous curricular decisions that do not qualify them for the benefits of a differential funding arrangement.

The Commission offers the following plan which adheres to these considerations. The plan is a continuation of the illustration presented earlier in the report concerning categorical and differential funding. While the data in that example are based on best estimates available to the Commission, it did establish, subject to actual verification by a cost analysis study, a target of \$60,615,000 as the total state support needed in FY 1980 that would satisfy three of the four considerations listed above. This amount, however, is \$10,844,000 above the funding level for 1979 and doubtlessly surpasses the state's ability to provide the full amount immediately. The Commission, therefore, suggests that this amount be reached in five years as demonstrated in the table that follows. Under this plan, for each year of the five year phase-in period that state funding does not match the Commission's target, the target amount would rise at the same rate as the increase per FTE in the state college sector of higher education (here, the assumed increase is set at 5% and 7%).

**Phase-In Schedule If State Support
To Other Sectors Rises at 5%
('000s)**

Year	Increase in Target Amount	State Support Needed for Phase-In	Percent of Needed Increase	Difference from target	FTE
1979		\$49,731			\$ 726
1980	\$60,615	53,784	8.15%	\$6,831	785
1981	63,646	58,167	8.15%	5,479	849
1982	66,828	62,908	8.15%	3,920	918
1983	70,169	68,035	8.15%	2,134	993
1984	73,678	73,678	8.15%	0	1,076

**Phase-In Schedule If State Support
To Other Sectors Rises at 7%
('000s)**

Year	Increase in Target Amount	State Support Needed for Phase-In	Percent of Needed Increase	Difference from target	FTE
1979		\$49,731			\$ 726
1980	\$60,615	54,260	9.8%	\$6,355	797
1981	64,858	59,989	9.8%	4,869	876
1982	69,398	65,886	9.8%	3,512	962
1983	74,256	72,362	9.8%	1,894	1,056
1984	79,454	79,454	9.8%	0	1,160

Assuming that increases in community college budgets are controlled to equal the increase in state adjustments awarded to other postsecondary sectors, the state aid ratio will fall within the 43%-50% range. We believe that by meeting the needed aggregate support set for the first year, the amounts of support subsequently distributed to the respective colleges would not be less than what would have been distributed under the current system. It must be noted, however, that these data are based on rough information available to the Commission. Should actual cost analysis studies present data that vary from these projections, the state would need to be prepared to supplement the funds distributed to certain colleges with sufficient support to match the support level they received in the year previous.

In the event that full funding is not possible and that requisite funds are not available, the Commission recommends that the categorical portion receive first priority for increased funds.

If differential funding is to be implemented on a phased basis because of the phase-in schedule for the total increase recommended by the Commission, it is imperative that the differential be provided by a significant amount—not a token amount, as is currently the case in New York and Pennsylvania. Therefore, the Commission recommends three priorities for the differential funding phase-in:

- Funds should first be provided for new regional or state-wide occupational/technical programs.
- Funds should then be provided for new county-based occupational/technical programs.
- Finally, funds should be provided for existing occupational/technical programs and remedial and developmental programs.

Once actual state support has matched the target amount established by reviewing aggregate community college expenses, program costs, and enrollments by the Department of Higher Education, subsequent increases would be linked with adjustments per FTE awarded to other sectors of higher education, particularly the state colleges. Further, the Commission recommends that as this process continues in succeeding years, satisfactory safeguards are needed to initiate immediate remedial action should the level of state support repeatedly fall outside the 43% to 50% range. That is, if state support falls 2% below the 43% minimum for two years once the targeted level of funding has been met or if the State has been unable to meet the proposed funding target in the designated five year period, the Commission recommends that the Board of Higher Education create an independent commission to review the State's funding performance and county college budgeting practices and recommend satisfactory changes to the appropriate body. The Commission believes that this extraordinary action must be taken because state support for community colleges should not fall below the level of state funding for elementary and secondary education. In view of state manpower training needs and the educational needs of citizens, the support for the education of adults should not be lower than this level.

The Commission recommends this procedure in its belief that the State must, as it has in the past, decide what it is able to support in the higher education sector while at the same time assuming its proper share of existing and increased costs for operating the community college system. The Commission believes this recommendation to be an equitable accommodation for bringing the level of state support to a satisfactory level and creating a better balance among the contributions of the state, the counties, and the student population. The Commission believes that this plan recognizes the goal of maintaining low tuition and the fact that ever increasing state-wide interests as well as local community interests are served by each county college.

RECOMMENDATION 49: THE COUNTY GOVERNMENTS SHOULD NOT DECREASE THEIR LEVEL OF SUPPORT PER FTE AS STATE AID INCREASES.

As additional state support to the community college system is forthcoming, effective measures must be established to forestall the tendency of the respective county governments to decrease their support. To do otherwise would be to nullify the substance and intent of the Commission's recommendations and to misdirect the salutary effect additional state support would have for improving the quality of education in the community college sector. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that, for community colleges to receive the benefit of annual increases in state support, the counties must designate, at a minimum, the same level of support for the next fiscal year as the year previous.

The Financial Implications of Open Access

Tuition

The community colleges in New Jersey represent the only sector of public higher education committed to open access. The success of this open door policy depends on geographic accessibility, student support services, and low tuition. With regard to the latter, the State must assure

a clear differentiation of community college tuition rates from those of other sectors.

RECOMMENDATION 50: TUITION AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD NOT EXCEED 25% OF THE AVERAGE EDUCATIONAL COST PER FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT STUDENT.

Under the present funding procedures, student tuition and fees account for at or somewhat above 25% of the operating costs of the community colleges. The Commission believes that this 25% level is an appropriate fair share for student contribution but that increases beyond that amount may create an economic barrier to open access for the low to middle income student.

In fact, the present tuition rate structure at New Jersey public institutions has a regressive effect, since community college and state college students, who are generally from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, have paid a higher share of the cost of their education than have students at Rutgers, NJIT and CMDNJ. It should be noted that the base on which the percentage of student contribution is currently determined for the county colleges includes items not now part of the base in other sectors. Certain personnel and administrative costs of the state colleges and other public institutions are paid directly by the State, while community colleges must pay for them from their operating budgets.

The recent tuition policy approved by the Board of Higher Education on November 17, 1978 for the FY 1980 budget is based on the principles which have New Jersey undergraduates assuming 30%, and non-resident undergraduates and all graduate students contributing 45% of the average educational cost per full-time-equivalent student. While the Board did not extend this judgment to the community college sector, the Commission specifically recommends that the current level of tuition, already above 25% of general and educational costs be lowered to the 25% level and maintained.

Several community colleges have been providing course offerings to senior citizens at little or no tuition, and the charge to the Commission requested review of this issue. Recent legislation recognizes and supports this practice. Senior citizens and many of the community college students who work pay both taxes and tuition, and care should be taken to minimize the inflated expense to these citizens. Thus we endorse the recent legislation, but we believe that implementation should be the prerogative of each community college, rather than a system-wide requirement.

Recommendations advanced regarding the mission of the community colleges clearly called for eliminating artificial and administrative barriers to the primary mission of increasing access to educational opportunity. This expansion of opportunity to the citizens of the state must also be supported by legislative accommodation whereby the counties will approve support of native students who wish to enroll in any credit course or program at community colleges in other counties. This approval is limited by the 20 mile radius (from home or work) rule mentioned in the mission recommendation to prevent damaging outmigration of students to other community colleges. The Commission believes, however, that this recommendation will not constitute a hardship and will significantly enhance the principle of educational access within the state.

RECOMMENDATION 51: THE CURRENT LEGISLATION GOVERNING THE CHARGE-BACK ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN COUNTIES SHOULD BE REVISED TO REQUIRE REIMBURSEMENT AT A RATE EQUAL TO THE AVERAGE COST OF THE PROGRAM.

Although this recommendation supports the Commission's position regarding regionalization of community college offerings, it is primarily intended to eliminate the increasing reluctance of a county to accept non-county students in their college's program—particularly high cost programs.

This reluctance occurs because the current legislation mandates that the receiving county be reimbursed according to the average county support for a native student rather than the average cost per FTE for students enrolled in a particular program. The Commission recommends that

counties receiving in-state, non-resident students be reimbursed at this latter rate. To ensure that the principles of access, equity, and regionalization are advanced within the state system, effective steps must be taken to minimize if not eliminate financial losses a receiving institution and county might face as is now the case when a non-county resident seeks to enter a community college in the next county.

The Commission further recommends that financial equity in the chargeback system be enhanced by requiring the sending county to share as well in the capital costs the receiving county has invested. This amount should be added to the appropriate share of operating support only when the sending county has no college or when the program pursued is not offered by the county's own community college (and in other instances determined by the Department of Higher Education).

Support for Plant Renewal and Replacement

The Commission is concerned that the large public investment in the community colleges be protected. State support for new equipment, replacement, and minor renovation has been intermittent and incomplete. For example, while the State has funded these items on a matching basis with the counties, this support was interrupted and then was renewed this fiscal year.

RECOMMENDATION 52: THE STATE SHOULD CONTINUE ITS ANNUAL GRANT OF \$30 PER FTE (ADJUSTED ANNUALLY) TO EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE IF MATCHED BY THE COUNTY FOR THE PURPOSE OF RENEWAL AND REPLACEMENT OF EQUIPMENT, MINOR RENOVATION AND MAINTENANCE, AND LIBRARY MATERIALS.

The Commission believes that matching state support for minor capital and replacement activities should be a matter of routine funding rather than an intermittent activity. Whereas the current practice is for the State to hold these funds centrally with monies withdrawn by institutions when the need occurs, this recommendation calls for the direct disbursement of these funds to the community colleges. These funds would be dedicated for the purposes designed and would be protected from manipulation by any party for other purposes. The disbursement of these funds would be reviewed annually to assure that they were spent as dedicated. The Commission believes that the \$30 per FTE support should increase annually at the same rate as increases in FTE are given to all sectors of postsecondary education.

It is important to indicate that this recommendation does not affect the recommended categorical aid for plant operation and maintenance at \$2.00 per internal gross square foot or the disposition of funds available through N.J.S. 18A:64A-22 (Chapter 12, PL 71, the County College Board Act) dedicated to major capital and renovation needs.

RECOMMENDATION 53: THE STATE BY STATUTE SHOULD PERMIT COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO ACCUMULATE AND MAINTAIN A RESERVE, WITHIN SPECIFIED LIMITS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES.

The Commission advances this recommendation in the belief that the community colleges must be able to transfer certain miscellaneous funds to a reserve dedicated to meeting emergency and planned minor capital needs. Once dedicated to this reserve, the funds would be protected from subsequent transfer or use for other than capital purposes by any party. The funds would be dispensed under the authority of the respective boards of trustees for the appropriate purposes. The Commission believes that a ceiling for these reserves should be set at 2% of current physical plant value at these institutions. An annual audit should be undertaken to review the use of these funds.

Financial Aid to Part-time Students

An increasing proportion of community college students enroll on a part-time basis. In fact, they outnumber full-time students in many institutions. While this may not be characteristic of

other sectors of higher education, it is a growing trend in the community colleges.

RECOMMENDATION 54: STATE FINANCIAL AID SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO PART-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CREDIT COURSES.

The Commission found it particularly disconcerting that the provision of financial aid seems to be based on the assumption that the full-time student cannot pay tuition while part-time students who may be working and earning income are able to pay the tuition amount. This assumption must be challenged in consideration of the demands of family support, taxes, and other requirements part-time students must meet. The Commission is not calling for preferential treatment of these students. It believes that awards should be made on the same basis of need as full-time students. At a minimum, it believes that part-time students should qualify for financial aid on a prorated basis.

The Commission also recommends that the Department of Higher Education review the policies and procedures for securing financial aid to consider the community college student who, as a matter of upbringing and experience, may not plan as traditionally college-bound students would. Experiences at the community colleges have proven that some device is necessary wherein limited funds can be set aside for "emergency," or short notice financial aid needs.

The Basis for State Support and Distribution

FTE Calculation

RECOMMENDATION 55: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FTE CALCULATION SHOULD BE CONGRUENT WITH OTHER SECTORS WHILE RETAINING ATTRIBUTES UNIQUE TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNCTIONS WHICH ARE PART OF THE PRESENT FORMULA.

This recommendation is consistent with the principle of parity throughout the higher education system. As a basic accounting theory, the concept of equating effort with revenues has been in effect for many years. Application of this concept to the community college system will assure both the county and State that they are supporting the actual result of work completed through the generation of contact hours, the unit of direct labor cost within this labor intensive enterprise. However, the desired equity must take into account the community college functions now part of the present formula for the colleges. For example, the practice of accounting for summer enrollment levels and unique community college functions relating to the mission of community service should continue to be part of the FTE calculation.

Currently, the community college calculation is based on one FTE per 30 hours for part-time students and one FTE per 24 hours for full-time students. Four hundred fifty student contact hours (50 minute periods) generated by non-credit courses yield a single FTE. It is important to note that while the shift to the use of "equalized credit hours" (ECH) leading to the FTE determination will not affect the current treatment of part-time students, it may result in a net loss when applied against full-time students. The use of a uniform enrollment formula will, nevertheless, be beneficial to the allocation of state funds among the various sectors. Because the Commission recommends this action, which may decrease support compared to the current practice, the Commission also recommends that once a standardized formula is implemented, a careful review of the impact of this change be undertaken to assure that adequate support for the system is protected.

Quarterly Disbursement

RECOMMENDATION 56: STATE AID TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE PROVIDED ON A QUARTERLY BASIS.

As part of its charge, this Commission reviewed the manner and frequency with which state aid is transferred. It found that aid to community colleges is currently provided on a quarterly

basis. Expenditures tend to be relatively regular on a monthly basis, particularly September through June. The Commission believes that the current disbursement practice constitutes an administrative benefit to the colleges and to the State, and sees little reason to suggest a change at this time.

IMPLEMENTATION

It is recognized that there is a master planning process underway, and that the work of the Commission will, at some point, be integrated into that process. However, since very few of our recommendations significantly affect the other sectors of higher education in the state of New Jersey, we strongly urge that implementation take place at the earliest possible time.

During the months the Commission has worked together, much enthusiasm and commitment regarding the focus of our deliberations—the community colleges of New Jersey and their role in postsecondary education—have been generated. We firmly believe that the recommendations set forth in this report are reasonable, balanced, and attainable. Since, for the most part, the report presents an integrated set of principles, policies, and related actions, we would be concerned about selective endorsement or implementation. The Commission would hope that any Department of Higher Education and/or Board of Higher Education analyses of the report would be brought to our attention.

The Commission as a whole or its Executive Committee would be happy to further explain the rationale for its recommendations.

If the Commission's recommendations are viewed favorably by the Board of Higher Education and the Chancellor, we would suggest the following implementation schedule:

- Recommendations related to funding be implemented no later than FY 1981. The next Board of Higher Education budget recommendations, forthcoming in October 1979, should reflect the funding level and mechanism called for in this report.
- Recommendations requiring new statutes or statutory amendments be acted on to permit their introduction during this legislative session.
- Recommendations requiring action on the part of the individual institutions (primarily those related to mission) be in place by the beginning of the next academic year (1979-1980). Those merely requiring Board of Higher Education affirmation of certain principles should be addressed prior to the end of the current academic year.

An additional issue central to the timely and effective implementation of this report relates to the Office of Community College Programs in the Department of Higher Education. This Commission has examined many aspects of the mission, governance, and financing of the New Jersey community colleges. A large number of changes have been recommended which will require that the State Department of Higher Education undertake an increased share of activities related to the community colleges including technical support (e.g., staff development, trustee orientation programs), monitoring (e.g., regional assignment of high cost technology programs), and evaluation (e.g., differential funding formulas, and studies of attrition, transfer achievement, and graduate placement).

The Commission is concerned that the Office of Community College Programs may require additional resources to adequately carry out its increased obligations. A careful review of the Community College Office should be undertaken to ensure that it has the resources, responsibilities, and authority to implement those of the Commission's recommendations for which it has responsibility.

Transmittal of this report constitutes the completion of the Commission's responsibilities as set forth in its Charge. The members of the Commission have not only a continuing interest but a

commitment to the future development of the New Jersey community colleges. In view of this, we would welcome being informed concerning conclusions reached with regard to the report and its recommendations.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

INTRODUCTION

The Commission to Study the Mission, Financing, and Governance of the County Colleges conducted seven public meetings between June 5 and September 19, 1978 to afford interested parties an opportunity to provide information and opinion on the major issues being addressed by the Commission. Approximately eighty individuals shared their views, and many others participated informally. A summary of the testimony, which attempts to reflect the dominant themes and emphases of the public meetings, and a listing of those persons presenting statements follow.

TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE MISSION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The vast majority of people who addressed the Commission supported the comprehensive thrust of the community colleges as delineated in the *Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of New Jersey*, Phase II, 1974 (cited earlier). Speaking for the county college presidents, Dr. Gustavo Mellander stated: "We are not vocational-technical institutes, we are not liberal arts colleges, we are not night schools, we are not day schools, we exist not only for the poor or poorly prepared. We are all of these—and more. That is what we mean when we say we are comprehensive county colleges."

Components of A Comprehensive County College

Open Access

The provision of open access to higher education for all citizens is the primary mission of the community colleges in New Jersey. In order to be open access institutions, the community colleges must keep tuition costs down, be accessible to service-area residents, maintain flexibility in programming, and be responsive to community needs.

No one who addressed the subject of mission suggested that the "open door" be closed. The questions raised before the Commission concerning open access focused on the problems of providing developmental education and maintaining academic standards. The delegation from Essex County College made a statement on open access which addressed both of these questions:

Community colleges have developed programs in response to the open door mandate which make no assumption regarding previous educational experience. These programs take into account the cognitive development and problem solving ability of the student and provide experience in reading, study skills, basic mathematics and practical English communication. Through these programs, students have been provided the means of coping successfully with college level work and the challenge of career implementation.

While we support open access and open admission for individuals and adults 18 years of age and over, we are also cognizant of the moral and academic implications of such a policy. Therefore, we have established minimum acceptable entrance standards which spell out the requisite skills and proficiencies required to successfully complete the program in which the student seeks admission. . . .

. . . In many ways, either the caliber of the student or the low level of skills development of the student presents genuine problems for the educator. But, in no way should solutions be sought that dilute academic excellence. At the least, this approach is condescending and patronizing. It is ultimately self-destructive.

Dr. Alban E. Reid expressed the views of the Council of County Colleges on the subject of the open door and academic standards:

There has been some concern expressed regarding the open access policy at the county colleges. It should be understood that in defining itself as an open door institution, the community college does not imply that it has abandoned its commitment to standards but rather that it simply means anyone should be able to attend the community college and to utilize its services and draw from it those educational experiences for which the student is qualified. Because the community college maintains a wide range of differentiated programs which are responsive to differing educational needs, interests and abilities of students, it is probably in the best position among all post-secondary institutions to serve the total range of student ability. The community colleges maintain appropriate admission requirements for their several programs. For example, that program which may be described as paralleling the university lower division experience has and continues to have the same admission requirements as exist on the university campus. Students are required to meet certain prerequisites as a condition of being admitted to courses and programs which have such prerequisites. On the other hand developmental and remedial courses are designed to take students from where they are based upon standardized testing, and to assist them in progressing systematically toward their educational goals.

Academic Transfer

One function of the comprehensive community college is to provide local, low cost liberal arts education which is equivalent to the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program (A.A. or A.S. degree).

Dr. Mellander noted that liberal arts have been downgraded somewhat in recent years and said that the county colleges must maintain strong liberal arts offerings if they are to produce "well-rounded" students.

In presenting a statement to the Commission on behalf of the New Jersey Education Association, Mr. Jerry Veldof said:

It does no good to talk about a new statewide plan that would 'differentiate among the missions of the various types of institutions to maintain a balance between liberal arts and occupational offerings and between individual interests and societal demands' if this means that the county colleges will be restricted in their ability to offer liberal arts courses AND cultural attractions to the citizens within their geographic area.

Mr. Veldof also noted, "There is a great deal of talk today about 'the disease of specialization'. The removal of liberal arts from the mission of the county colleges would merely perpetuate this 'disease'."

Liberal arts courses are also a component of the community colleges' continuing education programs. Many students participating in these programs study languages, history, art, science, or music—not to obtain a degree, but to enrich their lives. Ms. Carol Pagano, Coordinator of Financial Aid, Career Counseling and Placement at Bergen Community College, offered as an example:

The doctor, the senior citizen, and the Vietnam refugee should continue to meet in the history course, one in preparation for a trip to Europe, one because a book she read piqued her curiosity in delving further on the subject, and the third to gain the liberal arts background for a degree.

Occupational/Vocational Education

The 1974 Master Plan said that the community colleges should "... take the lead in providing post-high school occupational and vocational programs of shorter duration than baccalaureate programs."

The Council of County Colleges believes that the county colleges should offer one and two-year technical, vocational, and occupational career programs designed for job entry, job upgrading, and job transfer.

Mr. David H. Tyrrell, Dean of the Division of Engineering Technologies at Middlesex County College, described appropriate programs as those which "... provide for a balanced emphasis between manipulative skills and theory ... and should include a significant general education component. ... in order to provide breadth and a foundation for future development."

Both Mr. Tyrrell and Dr. Elric Cicchetti, Superintendent of Mercer County Vocational/Technical Schools, spoke to the Commission about the roles of the four sectors of education which are involved in vocational/technical education: the Area Vocational Technical Schools (AVTSs); the proprietary schools; the county colleges; and the four year institutions. Mr. Tyrrell said that the AVTSs and proprietary schools should provide certificate or non-degree courses which emphasize the manipulative skills and related theory necessary to prepare skilled craftsmen and service technicians for entry level positions. The community colleges should provide certificate and associate degree programs, and the four-year institutions should be responsible for baccalaureate and graduate level programs.

The proponents of occupational/vocational education programs in the county colleges believe that such programs are valuable because they create a career ladder. Dr. Cicchetti noted:

The effects of career education on vocational education will undoubtedly cause many students to enter higher levels of an occupational field upon high school graduation. Advanced certificate and/or associate degree programs in specific technical areas will have to be developed as a result of this growing trend.

Through the vocational/technical courses in the community colleges the technician or skilled craftsman can upgrade his/her skills at that point in his/her career where it becomes necessary, convenient, or desirable to do so.

The Commission heard statements from four individuals who represented the State's proprietary schools. Mr. Robert Bocchino, President of DeVry Technical Institute, said that if the county colleges become more career oriented, there may be competition between them and the proprietaries. Mrs. Lillian Kerzner, President of the Private Career School Association of New Jersey, said that the county colleges should remain colleges and that they should not "... become involved in vocational school certificate programs. Inasmuch as the private vocational and trade schools are filling the need in that sector of education, the county colleges should not duplicate their programs and facilities at the taxpayers' expense." Both Mr. Bocchino and Mrs. Kerzner suggested that the county colleges should contract out career oriented, short-run programs to the proprietary schools in order to avoid this duplication of services.

Mr. Leslie Balter, President of the Plaza Technical Institute and Vice President of the Career School Association of New Jersey, told the Commission that the proprietary schools which succeed do so because they have a narrow and clearly defined mission. Proprietaries have what he described as ultimate accountability—if they do not succeed in properly training their students for existing jobs, they go out of business. Mr. Balter suggested that the county colleges should stop trying "to be all things to all people," recognize that they are colleges, and concentrate on being good ones.

Community Services

As community-based education centers, one function of the comprehensive county colleges is to provide certain services which can be specifically tailored to the needs of their communities. The Commission heard a great deal of testimony which addressed the question of what the scope and extent of county college community service programs should be.

Community services divisions at New Jersey's county colleges offer short-term courses, lectures, seminars, workshops and conferences designed to meet specific needs or special interests of various groups and the general public. According to Ms. Anita Voorhees, Director, Division of Community Services and Special Projects at Middlesex County College, community services "... maintain ongoing dialogue with the college's constituencies—with business and industry, schools, labor organizations, social service agencies, and professional societies."

Community services programs offer a wide range of courses to non-traditional students—high school dropouts, the unemployed, the underemployed, mature women, senior citizens, the disadvantaged, and the handicapped—whose educational needs may not be addressed by the credit-based courses of standard college curricula. According to Ms. Voorhees "... the majority of students who enroll in community classes are not interested in credit and are extremely

threatened by grades and examinations." Positive experiences for these adults in community services courses can be the first step toward making a commitment to continuing education.

Ms. Voorhees believes that community services programs are a vital part of the county college mission:

As enrollment in traditional credit programs is stabilizing, the future growth of the two-year college has to be in the area of community-based education where there is virtually unlimited potential for educational programming. . . programs on topics such as preventive health measures, survival tactics for consumers, the problems of the elderly, parent-child relationships, state policy and issues, help individuals become contributing members of the community and informed voters on public issues. Our offerings center on the trends, interests and concerns of the times in which we live. In addition, cultural development demands exposure to various art forms and our events are planned to increase cultural awareness and appreciation and to help individuals attain historical perspective.

Mr. William Huber, President of the Association of New Jersey Community College Continuing Education and Community Service Directors, described the various ways in which community services divisions at the county colleges are staffed and supported. Divisions are run by persons functioning at levels ranging from Executive Dean to Coordinator; for some it is a full-time responsibility while for others it is an adjunct activity. Community services budgets range from next to nothing to \$1,000,000, and division staffs may consist of anywhere from two to fifty people.

Adult and Continuing Education

Continuing education programs provide credit and non-credit courses and a variety of educational experiences for the many people who do not attend college full time.

Continuing education enables working adults to retrain or upgrade their skills. Dr. Alban E. Reid, Association of Community College Presidents, Council of County Colleges and President of Bergen Community College speaking on behalf of the Council of County Colleges, noted:

It is important to acknowledge that the average working adult will be employed in five to seven different occupations throughout a work life. The community colleges constitute the best institutional vehicle for serving the need both of the worker and of business and industry for training and retraining to respond to this phenomenon.

As a college education becomes the prerequisite for more and more jobs, the demand for continuing education programs will escalate.

Remediation/Developmental Education

If the county colleges are to fulfill their mission as open access institutions of higher education without lowering academic standards, they must provide developmental programs for basic skills deficient students.

Dr. Gustavo Mellander told the Commission: "We live in amazing times. Students graduate, graduate mind you, from high schools without being able to read and write." Before they can acquire a college education, these students must learn basic skills and develop self-discipline. If the county colleges do not wish to extend social promotion into 13th and 14th grades, they must develop effective remedial programs.

In discussing the appropriateness of basic skills programs in the community colleges, the Essex County College delegation made the statement:

It seems to us to be very much the responsibility of the county colleges to serve students who are underprepared either through lack of desire to achieve at the secondary level or because of the lack of quality educational experiences provided to them by the educational system in which they were involved as adolescents. County colleges must play a significant role in equipping individuals with the critical skills necessary to reasonably partake of available opportunities in their community.

Dr. William Lutz of the Department of Higher Education's Basic Skills Council described for the Commission the purpose and operation of the Council, and cited some preliminary results from New Jersey's basic skills program. He pointed to two studies which indicate that students who

are identified as being skills deficient and receive remediation do even better in college than students who demonstrate basic skills proficiency on the tests.

The consensus of the testimony before the Commission on the subject of developmental education is: the community colleges must provide adequate remedial/developmental courses if they are to keep the "open door" from becoming a "revolving door." Remediation is expensive and it is difficult, if not impossible, to fund good remedial programs under the current funding formula. However, the statement from the Essex County College delegation points out:

It is a much less costly alternative to provide the disenfranchised members of the community with important life skills so they can be more productive and improve the quality of life for themselves and their community than their becoming statistics in prisons, on welfare rolls and other unemployment compensation categories.

Counseling Services

If the county colleges are to effectively serve students who are uncertain about their educational interests or abilities and want to explore a variety of occupational and academic programs, they must have strong guidance programs. Counselors are needed to advise students in the mechanics of admissions, placement, registration, and scheduling. Students rely on professional guidance in exploring curriculum alternatives and career choices. Many students also need help in developing the positive self-image necessary for success in college or work. Some students have career goals which are not congruent with their abilities and they need to be redirected.

Ms. Pamela Sorrells, Editor of Burlington County College's student newspaper, stated that she believes it is necessary for the county colleges to be "... oriented towards motivating students." She thinks the county colleges should expand counseling services:

Besides showing students the opportunities open to them and evaluating their capabilities according to written placement tests, counseling services should help students discover their potential on an individual and personal level.

Mrs. Helen E. Marshall, a representative of the Student Government Association of Essex County College, told the Commission that many non-traditional students have difficulty obtaining financial aid because they are taking less than a full credit load, their income disqualifies them, or they have assets which disqualify them.

Ms. Carol Pagano, Coordinator of Financial Aid, Career Counseling and Placement at Bergen Community College, told the Commission that a statewide plan for career counseling and placement programs is needed for the county colleges:

A great deal of lip service has been given to the importance of preparing students for the work world. And it is true that every student in the county college, except for perhaps some of the senior citizens, does or will hold a job one day. Much thought has been given to the courses offered in specific career-oriented curriculums, advisory committees have given long hours to improve the educational offerings. However, the student support services have generally received low priority from teaching faculty and administrators.

Ms. Pagano deplored the underutilization of the federally-sponsored College Work-Study Program in New Jersey's county colleges. "The 17 county colleges have returned to the U.S. Treasury \$311,367 in FY 1975, \$446,380 in FY 1976, and \$223,051 in FY 1977."

Ms. Pagano outlined a statewide plan for career counseling and placement programs which would:

Recognize that career counseling is a specialized counseling function which cannot be lumped in with all other types of counseling. The enormous amount of career information and the continual updating of both national and local employment trends and statistics require full-time attention.

Dr. Florence Mintz of the Curriculum Laboratory at Rutgers University, submitted a statement to the Commission describing the need for career guidance at the community colleges. She pointed out that high school graduates enter the county colleges with "weak or non-existent decision-making skills." They drift from program to program and frequently end up dropping out of college.

Dr. Mintz also noted that one large contingent of non-traditional students—mature women—

are particularly in need of career counseling. Such women come to the community college with the desire to start, resume, or upgrade careers but without the "appropriate tools" to make decisions concerning what careers are best suited to their interests, abilities, and time constraints.

Dr. Mintz suggested that the county colleges develop a course in career education which would:

... call on the expertise of many sectors, i.e., the vocational guidance counselors, educators, labor unions, labor market economists, the employment community (professional, semi-professional and skilled areas) as well as government agencies to provide an articulated instructional package.

Articulation and Coordination Among Educational Institutions and Agencies

A great deal of the testimony presented to the Commission suggested that "cost effectiveness" should be the cornerstone of the county colleges' mission in the decades ahead. Statement after statement pointed to the need for greater cooperation and coordination among educational institutions and the various local, state, and federal agencies which are involved in educating and training the citizens of New Jersey.

Area Vocational Technical Schools (AVTSs)

The Essex County College delegation offered a statement regarding the possible cooperative model for the community colleges and the AVTSs:

A problem that has been resolved in only a few counties is the overlapping responsibility of the county college and the area vocational-technical schools. In general, the college has emphasized the degree component of the curriculum package while the vocational-technical schools have concentrated upon traditional practical vocational training. The mechanism which provides for an integration of postsecondary vocational technical educational at the county level has not been established. This is a major obstacle to effective educational planning and accountability. The two types of institutions do not need to be in conflict. A close articulation with a comprehensive program of learning at each institution is possible. A progressive flow from hands-on skill attainment to the broad conceptualization and theoretical construct can be developed with a certificate of skill issued by the vocational-technical school and an associate degree awarded by the county college. Such an arrangement would fit nicely into the curriculum trend in which college credit is offered for career experience and skills.

Dr. Elric A. Cicchetti, Superintendent of the Mercer County Vocational-Technical Schools described three advantages of joint programming between the AVTSs and the county colleges:

1. Instructional personnel and educational facilities can be shared, thus reducing duplication of effort and the competition for limited financial resources;
2. the articulation of existing programs between both institutions will permit an integrated system of career education between secondary and postsecondary education; and
3. continuous planning will allow greater flexibility for program innovation and new program development.

Dr. Cicchetti said that formal agreements between the institutions are needed and added, "Of course, no agreement will automatically guarantee success unless the personnel at both levels of education are willing to work together for the good of the community."

The statement of Mr. Charles A. Rosen, Chairman of the New Jersey Advisory Council on Vocational Education, described the Council's work on coordination of delivery systems for vocational education. Noting that, "... the development of a productive and cost-effective system of manpower training and education can only depend upon an organized mechanism for coordination. . . ." Mr. Rosen quoted the Council's 1972 recommendation that a joint task force of the Department of Education and the Department of Higher Education be established to:

1. Develop long range plans for postsecondary education;
2. establish criteria for the allocation of funds;
3. develop some procedural and programmatic mechanisms which would be flexible to adapt to the needs of people; and
4. work out compatible definitions between what is a postsecondary student or program so that a realistic formula for disbursement of funds could be developed.

Mr. Rosen spoke of the 1202 Commission and the Education Coordinating Council established in 1972 and 1973, respectively, the County Career Coordinating Councils and the 107 Committee and described their failure to provide the desired organization. He added:

Council's continued call in 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977 for a compatible system to develop coordinated data not only for program effectiveness but also for the coordination of such areas as teacher education, guidance and counseling, job placement and follow-up, the use of the proprietary school system, and the linking of educational systems to the expertise of business and industry needs and techniques, in retrospect, has almost been a Siren's call where those who listened or talked about such nonsense, were in danger of being dashed against the rocks.

The Council believes that it is "imperative" for the Commission to "... establish a single authority or agency which can become the overall mechanism for identification, funding, and planning. . ."

In summary, the statement from the Essex County College delegation stated:

The mission thrust of the 1980's must also focus upon a more effective-working relationship between the approved programs offered within the Department of Higher Education and the Department of Education. The dilemma between what are currently postsecondary education vocational programs and the college career offerings must be clarified and redirected. The duplication of services, programs, equipment and facilities thwart the cost effectiveness we all seek.

Proprietary Schools

Mr. John Tinnesz, speaking for the Electronic Computer Programming Institute of Northern New Jersey and the Private Career School Association of New Jersey, questioned the intent of the county colleges to coordinate their programs with proprietary institutions. He cited the establishment of a data processing program at Passaic County Community College without his institution being consulted, and believes that this duplication constitutes an unnecessary expenditure of public funds.

The consensus of testimony from representatives of the state's proprietary schools seems to be that if the county colleges become more involved in occupational technical education, there will be a good deal of competition between the colleges and the proprietaries.

Four-year Institutions

Mr. Jerry Veldof, speaking on behalf of the New Jersey Education Association, noted:

Perhaps the single major reason why the mission (of the county colleges) should not be changed is the fact that most of the students attending county colleges do so in their own counties. Geographic proximity is the key to stimulating enrollment. Counties with colleges have higher "go-to-college" rates than counties without such institutions—in spite of chargeback opportunities. To suggest that the mission of county colleges should be changed so that there would be less liberal arts and humanities would thwart the opportunities and accessibility of colleges to thousands of citizens—not just college age students but minority groups, senior citizens, working women and middle-age men who play an increasing role in college participation. Students at county colleges come primarily from low to middle-income families. Transportation becomes an acute problem to those who cannot afford automobiles. Public transportation to existing colleges is difficult if not totally absent and to require this segment of our society to provide transportation to nearby state colleges and/or Rutgers University would disenfranchise this group from any accessibility to higher education. Remember, the county colleges have more part-time students than all of the state's colleges and universities combined.

Dr. Nathaniel Pallone, Associate Vice President for Adult and Continuing Education at Rutgers, The State University, asked the question, "Is there a problem in the 'holding power' of the community colleges?" Dr. Pallone quoted, "the latest available DHE data" which:

... indicate that approximately 25% of all community college students who transfer to senior institutions enter one of the undergraduate colleges at Rutgers; of those who enter Rutgers, 50% (12.3% of the total) enter University College, the undergraduate college for adult students. But of those who enter University College, the ratio between those transferring *before* earning an associate's degree and those transferring *after* is on the order of 7:1; comparable figures are not available for the University's other nine undergraduate colleges.

There is also a need for coordination and cooperation within the community college sector. In their remarks to the Commission, several speakers mentioned the need for regionalization of high-cost technology programs. Dr. Alban Reid, speaking for the Council of County Colleges, stated:

Consciously or unconsciously, community colleges have addressed the potential need for regionalization of high cost, highly specialized, low enrollment, low job market demand programs. Where it appears that a college is already offering such programs, other colleges have tended to work out a cooperative arrangement where their students can enroll in such programs, thus avoiding the need for duplication.

Speaking of duplication of services across all sectors of education, Ms. Anita Voorhees stated her belief that this impression often arises out of a lack of understanding of the comprehensive nature of community college programming.

The mere fact that two institutions are apparently conducting similar course offerings does not in itself constitute needless duplication. Such variables as responsiveness to a specific local need, or convenience for disadvantaged or otherwise immobile target populations, plus credibility within a given community may render both programs necessary complements to one another. The ability to provide adequate support services and the widespread demand for a particular offering must be taken into consideration. Also, in many cases the community college can draw from several local municipalities and provide a course that would not attract sufficient enrollment in any one of the local areas. There are many individuals for whom the two-year college's openness and non-threatening atmosphere, along with its record of quality programming, is an ideal combination that invites the adult's re-entry into the educational mainstream in a manner that is hard to emulate by any other institution.

State and Local Agencies

State agencies (outside of the education sector) which become involved with the county colleges do so primarily as part of their efforts to train or inform the public.

Mr. Richard Chumney, Director of the Division of Rural Resources, Department of Agriculture, told the Commission that, acting on a suggestion by his Department to the Council of County Colleges, seven community colleges have designated coordinators to facilitate the delivery of rural development services to their service areas. When questioned regarding possible duplication, Mr. Chumney said that the needs in these areas are great and cannot be handled by Rutgers Extension Service alone. "We think of the county colleges as an effective conduit (of services) . . . they constitute 18 additional centers."

Mr. Ira H. Dorfman, Administrator in the Office of Conservation, Department of Energy, told the Commission ". . . personal experiences have shown that state agencies do not take full advantage of the program offerings, facilities, and resources educational institutions have to offer." The Department of Energy would like to utilize the resources of the community colleges in the delivery of its Energy Extension Service programs. Mr. Dorfman described to the Commission what he considered to be the benefits of cooperation between his department and the community colleges:

Participation by the county colleges in a program such as the Energy Extension Service should provide a microcosm for evaluating what I believe the mission of county college education should include:

First, providing the general community with consumer information programs, and providing small business people in the community with an educational resource which may enable them to improve their business opportunities. These programs would at the same time provide our programs with more credibility (for the public generally trusts educational institutions more than it trusts government) and would also provide us with a vehicle to more widely distribute the information we have had difficulty disseminating.

Second, working with the Division of Vocational Education to broaden the opportunities available for vocational training to all county residents, especially the unemployed in employable skills.

There are many county and community groups which provide services similar to those of the county colleges. Mr. Peter Rosamilia, Vice Chairperson of the New Jersey Advisory Council for Adult, Continuing and Community Education, told the Commission:

Many groups with similar aims offer programs in unintended competition . . . We suggest that active involvement of county colleges with county-level and local-level advisory councils be advocated to achieve a high level of coordination and effectiveness. Many counties and communities have advisory councils for adult, continuing, and community education, career coordination activities, handicap services, health education, library and cultural activities, and CETA principal and sponsor advisory councils. Our thinking is that we should join in the development of an articulated structure of the affiliations of these groups to achieve effective collaboration and coordination.

The Advisory Council's 1977 Report to the Commissioner of Education recommended the development of a Master Plan for Adult, Continuing and Community Education which would involve the Departments of Education, Higher Education, Labor and Industry, and Community Affairs.

CETA Prime Sponsors

The purpose of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) is "To provide job training and employment opportunities . . . and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment."

Mr. Joseph A. Schlegel, Director, Gloucester County Employment and Training Administration, presented a statement to the Commission on behalf of the New Jersey Prime Sponsor Directors Association. The statement pointed to several examples of duplication of services between the county colleges and CETA:

There is not only the inefficiency of identical classroom training services such as diagnostic testing of educational levels and of remedial work for skills-deficient students, there are also larger concerns attendant upon a lack of coordination and communication. To what extent, for example, are both CETA and the colleges training people in the same skills and contributing to a flooded local labor market in certain occupations? Are job market analyses and job development practices at both agencies in unwitting competition?

Mr. Schlegel noted that early attempts at cooperation between the community colleges and CETA were thwarted by CETA's preoccupation with its own rapid growth and by a reluctance on the part of the colleges to become involved with CETA. Both groups have overcome their problems to the extent that cooperative enterprises now seem feasible and some programs have already been developed. Among these is the Early Specialization Program under which CETA clients in associate degree programs take job-related courses first and receive certificates of completion. They may then work while they finish the remaining degree requirements—often with financial assistance obtained through employers' tuition reimbursement plans.

According to Mr. Schlegel, "Some community colleges are also providing academic and vocational assessment of CETA clients and operating Learning Centers to prepare them for the High School Equivalency Exam, the Adult Basic Educational Test, and the Civil Service Test." Another possible cooperative effort, an experimental Vocational Exploration Program is in the planning stage. This program is being designed to give students ". . . in-depth exposure and hands-on experience in a variety of jobs coupled with intensive counseling."

Under the reauthorized Comprehensive Employment and Training Act there is an increased emphasis on classroom training over public service employment. This redirection creates new opportunities for the community colleges to provide services to CETA.

Many individuals from the community college sector pointed out the fact that the county college is in a unique position to equip students with work-related skills for the jobs which exist in its service area. Speaking on behalf of the council of County Colleges, Dr. Alban E. Reid said:

The community colleges have been among the first postsecondary institutions to develop a close relationship with representatives of business and industry in their counties in an effort to identify educational needs and to develop programs which are responsive to those needs. Community colleges have literally hundreds of community leaders who serve on their advisory committees in the effort to develop and maintain vocational, occupational and career curriculums which properly prepare students for the jobs that exist within the counties.

Ms. Anita Voorhees, Director of Community Services and Special Projects at Middlesex County College, noted, "The career orientation of many two-year colleges provides a par-

ticularly strong base for courses for the business community that equip employees and their employers with work-related skills to improve job performance and job-related capabilities." More specifically, Ms. Voorhees mentioned examples of labor pool-labor market matching by the county colleges:

Our CETA training programs were undertaken because of strong commitment to help in the County's struggle to combat unemployment. Many other courses are implemented in direct response to the specifications and guidelines set by a particular business or professional group. These offerings draw upon the expertise of full-time and adjunct faculty whose close ties to the world of work ensure relevant and timely instruction.

Ms. Voorhees also mentioned the county colleges' responsiveness to job market demands for retraining:

With knowledge obsoleting itself every five to ten years the pressure on employees to update their education is steadily mounting. Specialized courses and developmental course work are examples of the ways in which community colleges can meet the challenge of changing life styles, work patterns, and technology.

Dr. Joseph R. Fink, President of Somerset County College, told the Commission:

The shortage of skilled employees, which forces many New Jersey companies to search outside our state for qualified workers, can be filled by a close cooperation and coordination between county-community colleges and business, industrial, governmental and service communities in the identification of needs and planning and development of programs to satisfy those needs . . . The economic health of the State of New Jersey and our individual counties, *demands* that we work together toward the solution of these problems.

Mr. Joseph Schlegel, speaking for the New Jersey Prime Sponsor Directors Association, cited two examples of ways in which the community colleges could utilize their resources to respond to labor market needs. A CETA-funded project, the Private Sector Initiative Program, makes public funds available to private business for the purpose of training unskilled, unemployed people. Through this program, "Business will have the opportunity to make employment and training decisions and to develop occupational programs to meet local labor market demands. A consortium of local business and two-year colleges might be one way of implementing these training programs."

Another CETA-community college cooperative effort suggested by Mr. Schlegel also involves local industry:

A local pharmaceutical company . . . might have need of specifically trained laboratory assistants. The training, funded by CETA, could take place in the college's laboratory facilities at off-hours, perhaps between afternoon and evening classes. Similar use might be made of classrooms, lecture halls and other facilities.

Mr. E.J.J. Power of Bell Laboratories spoke to the Commission about the benefits of cooperation between business and the colleges.

Not enough can be said for strong programs that prepare students to be top performers on the employment scene. The design of these programs can be enhanced when there is a partnership created between education and employer. Each has a contribution to make and each should do so if education is to be timely, sound and usable.

Mr. Power described the impetus for Bell's cooperation with Middlesex County College:

Bell Laboratories is an employer of people trained in Computer Science and Electrical Engineering, among other disciplines . . . Since March of 1976, we have been engaged in a dialogue with the Department Chairmen of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering. The thrust of that dialogue has been flexibility within their degree programs. Essentially, we have pointed out that Bell Laboratories is an engineering and research company that uses both of these disciplines and that the most useful employee is one who has a mixture of these disciplines. What we are looking for is course options, or electives, that would allow Computer Science students to reinforce their programs with Electrical Engineering courses, and for Electrical Engineering students to reinforce their programs with Computer Science courses. The goal is to increase the employability of these students in technological work.

Mr. Power pointed to several positive outcomes of the Middlesex County College-Bell Laboratories partnership: flexible program options for students; an advanced minicomputer and micro-processor lab; the introduction of the Bell designed UNIX System in the College's com-

puter center; and a new program in computer graphics which is in preparation. According to Mr. Power, "This is sharing at its best, and it expands the opportunities for the students."

Cooperative Education

Cooperative Education is another area in which a partnership between business and the colleges can be advantageous. Dr. Maurice P. Hartley, President of the New Jersey Cooperative Education Consortium, defined cooperative education as "... an academic program which integrates on-campus study with off-campus work-learn employment related to the student's field of study and career objectives." In cooperative education programs at the county colleges, students typically work part of the day or week and attend school the rest of the day or week.

Dr. Hartley described some of the advantages of cooperative education for students at the community colleges:

Students are attracted to co-op by the notion that while they are going to college they can earn money, complement their on-campus studies with practical applications of the learning, and upon graduation have the opportunity for excellent job and career prospects. This is particularly true for the socioeconomically disadvantaged and minority students who have often been thwarted at the outset by an unresponsive educational system. This is an opportunity which is also inviting to older adults who are now returning to the classroom and job market after a long absence.

Cooperative education also benefits employers. According to Dr. Hartley:

Employers find that hiring cooperative education students significantly lowers recruiting costs, improves the retention rate of graduates, and assists in accomplishing affirmative action goals. Furthermore, employers are intrigued by the opportunity because they see the programs as one of the means of meeting their manpower needs with better educated and qualified personnel. Finding this untapped source of qualified workers may stem the tide of large corporations deserting the urban centers and the state at large in search of skilled, motivated, intelligent employees.

Dr. Hartley pointed out that initiating a cooperative education program is expensive. However, once established, it is a program which can help ease the student's financial burden. Dr. Hartley cited the results of a national study which concluded that "... as a financial aid device, cooperative education is more effective than any form of student financial assistance currently in use."

In summary, Ms. Pagano states what seems to be the consensus of the testimony presented to the Commission concerning the need for permanent coordinative links between and among those who educate and train for employment and those who employ.

Finally, each county college must develop a coordinating unit which encompasses all contacts with local business, industry and government agencies. Placement office personnel including co-op directors should share their valuable contacts and expertise with faculty working on course development, advisory committees and community service personnel. The college must work as one unit with many arms reaching out to meet the needs of the community. Only through interaction, coordination and planning will the county college succeed in its mission.

Staff Training and Development

Several individuals noted the importance of providing inclusive and effective training and development activities for faculty, administration, and staff at the community colleges.

Spokespersons for the Mid-Career Fellowship Program offered testimony on the nature of this cooperative staff development program of Princeton University and the community colleges of New Jersey. Theodore K. Rabb, Director of the program, described how ten to twelve experienced community college faculty attend Princeton University to engage in graduate study in their respective disciplines. The resumption of contact with their respective fields is augmented by a specially designed Fellows' Seminar where common teaching problems are discussed.

Faculty who have participated in the program also offered statements on behalf of this staff development effort. Kathy Earley of Middlesex County College underscored the impact of the Princeton program on her teaching effectiveness:

The discussions I had with humanists from other community colleges during my semester at Princeton as a Mid-Career Fellow and, at the same time, the experience of once again being a stu-

dent are both having a visible, positive effect on my teaching. Having had the opportunity to struggle with a definition for "the humanities" and with a defense for their existence in the community college curriculum has helped me understand, perhaps for the first time, why it is important that I am a community college English professor.

This recharging of my belief in the *necessity* of knowledge about literature and history and philosophy and psychology if one is to be truly educated has made me expect more of my students. I encourage them to do more outside reading, I do not speak "down" to them in a vocabulary purged of sophistication, I urge them to expect more of themselves than perhaps their environments have encouraged them to expect . . .

Because community college students often come to college with grave doubts about their competence, a subtle erosion in the professor's expectations can take place over years of teaching. This, combined with a community college professor's heavy teaching load (compared to that of a four-year college professor's responsibilities) and the lack of emphasis on individual research and writing, can seriously enervate a community college professor's teaching after five to ten years.

Charlee Frantino of Essex County College shared a similar experience:

At Princeton I was soon totally immersed in my graduate studies, "Shakespeare's Comedies" and "The Romantic Age." I met at least weekly with the other Fellows who were from Burlington, Mercer, and Morris County Colleges, and a warm rapport developed while we exchanged information and ideas. I was doing extremely well in my courses, my self-esteem grew, and my expectations about my own capabilities began to elevate. Finally, I was able to think—to think about my principles and my purpose in the classroom. Overall, it was an extremely happy and productive time.

I returned to Essex County College in January, 1978. This is now my third semester following my hiatus at Princeton. My teaching has changed, my response to the students has changed, and my productivity has trebled. The first semester back, I helped organize a state-wide conference on the teaching of writing which was held at Essex. Two of my colleagues have also recieved Fellowships, and our general optimism seems to have had a positive effect on everyone.

In his remarks, Brian Lewis of Burlington County College briefly discussed the rationale of a staff development program, and its contribution to the comprehensive mission of the community colleges:

Given the tight job market and high tenure ratios, staff turnover and growth are no longer providing the stimulation they once did. What is needed is an opportunity for faculty to engage in full-time graduate study away from their home institutions. . .

The goals of the Mid-Career Fellowship program provided for professional growth, improved professional standing and for extensive and continuing professional and pedagogic interchange with peers. I can honestly state that my experience at Princeton exceeded my highest expectations. . .

I would be remiss if I did not further observe that the Mid-Career Fellowship Program in particular, and Princeton in general has helped to rekindle my understanding of the value of a liberal arts education. I fear that those of us in the community colleges may be losing sight of what a college education is: True, it has a vocational component, as well as many other facets, but the uniqueness of a college education rests with a strong foundation in the liberal arts. What makes us a college is our obligation to provide that foundation.

Mr. Rabb indicated his hope that the Program would be expanded to include all members of community college staffs—scientists, technical faculty, and administrators—and urged the Commission to give serious consideration to the need for effective staff development.

TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE GOVERNANCE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Title 18A:64A-8 mandated the establishment of a board of trustees for each county college and prescribed the composition of such boards: ". . . the county superintendent of schools and eight persons to be appointed by the director of the Board of Chosen Freeholders with the advice and consent of that Board." The only qualifications for Board membership specified by the legislation are that appointees be U. S. citizens who have been residents of the county for four years prior to appointment. It also stipulated that the board of trustees of each college ". . . shall have custody of and be responsible for the property of the college and shall be responsible for the management and control of said college."

Autonomy

Most of the testimony concerning governance of the community colleges focused on their autonomy.

Dr. Lawrence Winchell, Jr., President of Atlantic Community College, quoted Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., who conducted a brief study of higher education in New Jersey:

The county community colleges are, in some respects, the most vital and impressive part of the New Jersey system despite (or perhaps because of) the fact that they are the institutions most independent within the system . . . They are a model of what can be achieved by state assistance with minimum control. They suggest what can be accomplished with autonomy.

Dr. Otto R. Mauke, President of Camden County College, asserted that the institutions in New Jersey which have the ". . . highest degree of autonomy, namely, the two-year colleges and Rutgers, are characterized by excellence due to their freedom from external control."

Mr. Jerry Veldof, speaking on behalf of the NJEA, described the "check and balance system" built into the county college governance structure, i.e., the county appoints board members but rules and regulations are established by the Board of Higher Education. The NJEA statement to the Commission recommends that the county colleges ". . . be allowed the autonomy that makes it possible for them to function successfully as they have done for the past eleven years."

Many speakers said that the present system of Freeholder appointed trustees is, to a great extent, responsible for the success of the county colleges. The autonomy of the community colleges is perceived to be rooted in Freeholder appointment of college trustees.

Several individuals emphasized that this appointing power should remain with the Freeholders. Ms. Leanna Brown, President of the New Jersey Association of Counties, told the Commission:

The appointing power for college trustees must be kept in the hands of the county governing bodies. The positive political connection defined as "The Art of Getting Things Done," is both obvious and necessary. Freeholders are capable of bringing the full resources of the counties to bear in contributing towards the full development of the county colleges. Close coordination between the county and college activities is essential to growth and more importantly to the full service potential of these institutions.

Mrs. Dorothy K. Power, a member of the Middlesex County Board of Chosen Freeholders, also described some of the advantages of Freeholder appointment of college trustees:

The Freeholders have achieved a high quality in the governing board at Middlesex County College. Members are appointed to the Board on the basis of a variety of expertise they bring in relation to the needs of the college. This also reflects the broad and diverse interests of the community reflected in the comprehensive nature of our college. We have also maintained a mix in relation to minority representation. Members of our Board make a significant contribution, with their only focus in this responsibility being the good of the college in its mission to meet community needs.

Mr. Richard Pearson, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Thomas E. Edison State College and former Trustee of Mercer County Community College, suggested that the Commission consider changing the governance structure of the county colleges. He proposed that a bare majority (five members) of the county college board be appointed by the Chancellor of Higher Education, with the approval of the Board of Higher Education. Mr. Pearson sees the Chancellor and Board of Higher Education as standing ". . . between the political structure and the colleges, thus serving to assure the educational integrity of the latter institutions." He urged placing the appointing authority for the majority of county college trustees in the hands of the Chancellor and the Board of Higher Education because ". . . they have no counterparts at the county level. This is why the present situation is fraught with negative connotations and should be changed."

Dr. Lawrence R. Winchell, Jr., President of Atlantic Community College, urged that trustee appointing authority remain with the freeholders but added: ". . . some of us recognize the possible benefit of a member's being appointed to each board from the service area of the college by the Board of Higher Education upon the recommendation of the Chancellor."

Dr. Alban Reid also made this point and noted that the Council of County Colleges

"... strongly believes that the primary basis for appointment to the Board of Trustees should be to assure the reflection on the Boards of the diverse elements of the colleges' broad constituency."

Freeholder Gary F. Simmerman of Cumberland County offered an opposing view:

The freeholders of each county, we believe, are better able to provide the necessary localized input into the selection of trustees than someone working in the state capitol who cannot possibly know the many subtle differences which exist among the 21 counties—and the subtle differences in the educational needs of the people of the 21 counties.

Ms. Dorothy Power said that she believes greater state control would get in the way of progress and good management at the community colleges. She fears that loss of local autonomy would result in "... failure to consider local educational needs to be met by a particular community college."

The Commission received a statement from the Student Government Association at Burlington County College which advocated that boards of trustees be representative of all of the colleges' constituencies. Such representation would include:

- 1) one voting recent alumnus (no more than 5 years out of the college) who is a local resident;
- 2) one voting county superintendent;
- 3) one non-voting faculty member, to be appointed by faculty organizations;
- 4) two non-voting students, to be appointed by student organizations and approved by faculty organizations; and
- 5) two non-voting members of the State Board of Higher Education who would attend at least one board of trustees meeting every six months.

The Optional County Charter Law and the County Colleges

Several individuals made statements before the Commission concerning the status of the county colleges in the four New Jersey counties which chose the County Manager form of government under the Optional County Charter Law. The speakers' comments focused on the recent litigation between the Board of Trustees of Mercer County Community College and Arthur R. Sypek, Sr., County Executive of Mercer County.

In 1976, the citizens of Mercer County voted to adopt the County Executive form of government. The Board of Chosen Freeholders subsequently attempted to appoint freeholders to the Board of Trustees of Mercer County Community College and to restructure the personnel and purchasing processes of the College. The Board of Trustees contended that community colleges are not organizations of county government within the meaning of the Optional County Charter Law and, therefore, the freeholders could not alter the structure of the College. The Trustees instituted litigation to prevent the County from implementing the proposed changes.

On May 20, 1977, Judge George Schoch of the Superior Court of New Jersey ruled against the Mercer County Community College Board of Trustees, finding that the community colleges are units of county government within the meaning of the Optional Charter Law. The Board of Trustees appealed the decision and, on June 21, 1978, the Appellate Division of the Superior Court reversed Judge Schoch's decision, holding that the community colleges are *not* agencies of county government subject to freeholder control under the Optional County Charter Law. Referring to this litigation, Mr. Veldof said:

The New Jersey Supreme Court has recently refused to hear the case on appeal. The Superior Court said that 18A "contains an extensive, integrated legislative scheme with established control and supervision of all education in the State."

In his statement to the Commission, Mr. Sypek indicated his belief that the Court's decision is not the final resolution of the matter.

Our Superior Court has held that this question is one that must be addressed by the legislature. So we will now seek to have the legislature resolve the inherent conflicts raised by these two laws. I think it is not only proper, but necessary that we pursue this course of action.

Mr. Sypek also told the Commission why he believes the County should have more control over the College.

We are now in a position of being morally committed to assign a very large amount of tax monies annually, tax monies for which I and the Board of Freeholders are responsible to our constituents with no input whatsoever in any area of financial management, for example, centralized purchasing at that college.

While Mr. Richard Pearson's assessment of the cause of the problem in Mercer County essentially agreed with Mr. Sypek's, he cautioned against control of the colleges by the county government.

The State of New Jersey bears a heavy responsibility for the long escalation of this problem in Mercer County. The root of the problem is financial: the long standing refusal of the state to bear its fair share of the cost inflation experienced by the colleges since the early 1970's . . . In strictly financial terms, the county officials are acting reasonably and responsibly in attempting to gain control over the college, when they are held accountable for its budget by the voters.

The real cost of this solution, however, is far too great. I know of no surer way to destroy the reputation of a college than to bring it under the direct control of a county government. For one thing, this will surely threaten an institution's accreditation. And in Mercer's case, we are dealing with a college whose national reputation ranks it among the top fifty of the 1100 community colleges in the country.

Recognizing that there may be continuing debate over community college governance in the four counties which adopted the County Executive form of government under the Optional County Charter Law, Dr. Winchell told the Commission that the Council of County Colleges:

. . . would hope that the principle of exemption of county colleges from the Optional County Charter Law as articulated in the Mercer case mentioned earlier be maintained. We urge this Commission to assume continued vigilance so that the autonomy of the county colleges is preserved.

Dr. Winchell also said that the Council believes that primary responsibility for budget approval and management should remain in the hands of the county college boards of trustees.

TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE FINANCING OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Funding Shares

According to N.J.S.A. 18A:64A-22 (original county college legislation):

The board of higher education shall formulate annual budget requests for state support of county colleges. Within the limits of funds appropriated to the board of higher education for such purposes and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the board of higher education, the board of trustees of a county college may apply to the board of higher education and receive state support:

- a. For capital projects approved by the board of higher education in amounts not to exceed one half of the cost of said capital projects, and
- b. For operational costs to the extent of one half thereof or \$600.00 per equated full time student, including such students resident in other counties, whichever is the lesser amount.

State support for the operational costs of county colleges shall be made within limits of state appropriation and only after an annual review and approval by the board of higher education of the financial program for operation of the county college, including the charges to be made for student tuition and fees and the establishment of the county share of said costs.

Several individuals who addressed the Commission referred to the original agreement between the state and the counties on the funding of the community colleges. Mr. Guy E. Millard, County Administrator of Somerset County, described his understanding of the Financial agreement between the State and the counties:

Thus all discussions of which I was aware were based on a funding premise—50% state and 50% county. It was further assumed that the county share would be borne equally by taxes and tuition. Thus, the core of the financial agreement was capital costs, state 50% and county 50%; operating costs, state 50%, county 25%, tuition 25%.

Mr. Millard asserted that the state has not lived up to this agreement.

Legislators have maintained an unreasonable ceiling of FTE spending. Governors and Chancellors have established arbitrary limits on the number of students to be funded at each college. The state

over these years has paid much less than its 50% share—by paying less than half the operating costs for fewer than all of the students.

Testimony presented by Mrs. Dorothy K. Power, member of the Middlesex County Board of Chosen Freeholders, was similar in content.

Looking back to the time when the county college legislation was enacted, the intent was expressed for a partnership in this educational concept of the two-year college system, in which the state would provide 50% of the funding, with the other 50% shared by the county and student tuition. This partnership has not been achieved. As the cost per student has climbed over the past 12 years, the fixed amount of state support per student has decreased its share. In fact, the student shares almost equally with the state, and the county is the balancer at a higher percentage each year.

Other speakers offered similar testimony, among them, Freeholder Harold L. Colburn of Burlington County; Mr. Richard Pearson, former Trustee of Mercer County Community College; Mr. Arthur Sypek, County Executive of Mercer County; Mr. George Albanese, Union County Manager; and Freeholder Gary F. Simmerman, of Cumberland County.

Ms. Leanna Brown, President of the New Jersey Association of Counties and Morris County Freeholder, told the Commission:

Since counties do not presently share in tax relief from the state income tax, it is more important than ever that the state make good on the financial agreement on costs: 50-50 with the county on all capital, including minor capital, and on operating costs, 50% State, to match equal shares of 25% each for county and student.

Mr. Jerry Veldof, speaking on behalf of the New Jersey Education Association, described the escalating cost of education at the community colleges.

Ten years ago the state set county college funding at \$600 per FTE or one-half of college operating costs, whichever was less. At that time it cost approximately \$1200 to educate a student. Today the cost is approximately \$2000 and the state's share was increased only to \$700 per FTE, which is thirty-five (35%) percent of the total cost. While the state increased its share by one-sixth the county governments have increased their share nearly threefold!

Mr. Veldof pointed out that student tuition and fees have increased from \$290 to \$500 in the last 11 years. He also pointed out that the counties, in view of the five percent "caps" initiated by the state, are not in a position to increase their financial commitment to the community colleges. The NJEA believes "... there is only one source that can afford to maintain New Jersey's county colleges—the STATE." Mr. Veldof proposed a solution:

The NJEA encourages the Commission to recommend a 75/25% funding ratio with the state and county government. This would double the state's share to \$1500 and the county share to \$500 and would eliminate tuition at the county colleges. The present system increases the burden on two groups who cannot afford it—the student and the county.

Clearly, the consensus of the testimony before the Commission is that the state has not honored what many perceived as its agreement to fund one half of the operating costs of the community colleges.

Dr. Alban E. Reid, speaking on behalf of the Council of County Colleges reiterated this point and then noted:

Additionally, the community colleges, while enrolling over 40% of all students in the State of New Jersey, receive less than 15% of the State higher education budget. By contrast, state colleges enroll 37.6% of the students and receive 38% of the budget.

Funding Mechanism

A formal funding arrangement is needed to provide for the continuity of community college programs and to reaffirm the state's commitment to the community colleges in an era of stabilized or declining enrollments.

Dr. Alban Reid described some of the characteristics of a funding mechanism which would be compatible with the goals of New Jersey's county colleges in the decades ahead.

Among the objectives of such a system is a funding mechanism based on sound cost accounting principles which will fund legitimate costs associated with the activity being supported. It has been suggested that the concept of fixed variable and semi-variable costs must be related to both funding

sources and the mission of the county colleges. The funding mechanism must reduce competition for students among the sectors of higher education by providing resources consistent with the mission of the sector. Tuition and fees should also be related to the nature of the institutions. The funding mechanism must recognize differing costs of instruction among and within institutions if quality high technology career programs are to be sustained in such a way as to provide opportunity to all New Jersey students and further the economic life of the state. Absolute dollar support must increase in response to inflation. The public's investment in operations, plant, and equipment must be protected. The funding mechanism must have integrity and must be flexible so as to meet the demands for service, legislative requirements and mandates from the Board of Higher Education. The mechanism should be reasonably automatic and regular in its operation as to allow its institutions and support agencies to plan rationally for their operation. The mechanism should avoid the need for legislative intervention.

Comments from many individuals involved with the community colleges also pointed to the need to develop a funding mechanism which would meet the criteria articulated by Dr. Reid.

Funding for Developmental Education

Several speakers discussed the need for the community colleges to develop and maintain effective developmental education programs for skills deficient students. Dr. William Lutz, Director of the Department of Higher Education's Basic Skills Council, commented:

In order to carry out their mission of maintaining an open door, New Jersey's two-year colleges will need adequate financial assistance. This assistance must recognize that educating a student in a remedial/developmental class is more expensive than educating the same student in a class such as freshman history, psychology, or sociology. A funding formula that does not take account of such differences can only hamper the colleges' efforts to provide the best education possible for all students, whether remedial or enrolled in a regular academic or professional program.

Funding for High Cost Technology Programs

The need to regionalize high cost technology programs, especially those with low enrollment and low labor market demand, was mentioned in many of the statements presented to the Commission. A number of individuals also pointed out the need for the state to differentially fund high cost programs such as Nursing and Dental Hygiene.

Mr. John P. Hanley, President of Mercer County Community College, asked the Commission to consider carefully the potential effects of the combination of differential funding and regionalization of high cost technology programs. The costs of high technology programs are not "average" and the colleges which run them must pay far more than the \$700 per FTE that the state provides. Mr. Hanley believes that the incentive therefore exists for colleges to offer high cost programs only to their own service area residents.

Mr. Louis Genovese, Controller of Essex County College, told the Commission:

Support should be received from the state to adequately support programs based on their cost (differential funding). At Essex County College the program cost ranges from approximately \$1,525 for a Liberal Arts program to \$5,350 for the Nursing program. The \$700 per FTE state support may be adequate for certain Liberal Arts programs, but surely not adequate for Career, Basic Skills and Career Tech.

Funding for Professional Development

Dr. Wilmot F. Oliver, Dean of Instruction at Ocean County College, presented a statement to the Commission noting that effective teaching is the most important function of the community college. Dr. Oliver told the Commission:

One main problem faced by many community colleges is the lack of adequate state financial support to enable the colleges to hire more full-time teachers and thus eliminate or reduce the many weaknesses that go with the employment of too many adjuncts. At the point that state support for the community college reaches the 50% level, this problem should be partially alleviated.

He pointed out that funding is needed to support career development activities, and recommended that "the Department of Higher Education should provide a minimum of 1% of each community college operating budget to support professional development activities." Mr. John

Hanley told the Commission that Mercer County Community College attempts to hire instructors who have practical experience and encourages them to keep abreast of changes in their specialties. He noted that it would be helpful if the state's funding formulas encouraged this practice, too.

Dr. Saul Orkin, President of Union College, also argued the case for state funding of staff development programs at the community colleges. Dr. Orkin believes that funds should be provided to retrain faculty whose special knowledge no longer equips them to serve the perceived needs of new student populations. Mr. Hanley pointed to the colleges' high tenure rates and stated that categorical aid for staff development would enable instructors to keep abreast of changes in their specialties, and would permit colleges to retrain faculty for the purpose of shifting them from areas of limited demand to areas of expansion.

Funding for Non-Credit Courses

Mr. William Huber, President of the Association of New Jersey Community College Continuing Education and Community Service Directors, told the Commission:

In the area of community education, the action last year which redefined those non-credit courses that were eligible for state support has made it more difficult for community colleges to serve local needs. Many of us believe that current policies and funding practices may be counter-productive. Reduced FTE support is a most serious development.

Funding for Inflationary Increases

With state support of the county colleges set at \$700 per FTE, and tuition and fee ceilings mandated by Board of Higher Education action, the counties must absorb all inflationary increases in community college costs.

Ms. Leanna Brown, President of the New Jersey Association of Counties, referred to the counties as the "partner of last resort" in the funding of the county colleges. She pointed out that the "caps" on county spending imposed by the state are making it even more difficult for the counties to fund the inflationary increases at the colleges.

Mr. John Hanley called on the Commission to recommend a funding formula which will recognize factors such as negotiated increases in fringe benefits for personnel and other inflationary costs which are beyond the college's control.

Mr. Louis Genovese told the Commission that the present state funding system is not a sound and equitable base capable of supporting the mission of the county colleges in the 1980's. The fixed state support of \$700 per FTE does not recognize the inflation by which the community college budgets have grown. Mr. Genovese suggested that an inflation adjustment, based on the Education Price Index, be added to the present funding arrangement.

Funding for the Brokerage Model

Mr. Joseph Scott, Vice President of Hudson County Community College Commission, described the mode of operation of his brokerage institution to the Commission. He noted:

While it is clear that Hudson has bypassed the cost of capital construction by employing a brokerage model, it is also true that Hudson County Community College Commission incurs variable, semi-variable, and fixed costs in a manner different from the conventional county college.

Mr. Scott told the Commission that he wanted to call its attention to the brokerage model "... to safeguard against the development of a funding formula which may be biased against this timely if not temporal mode of educational delivery."

Funding for Part-time Students

There are more part-time students attending New Jersey community colleges than full-time students. The community colleges in this state enroll more part-time students than all the other sectors of higher education combined.

Mr. Malcolm Pennypacker, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Burlington County College, told the Commission:

The present (funding) formula, based on FTE, tends to put the part-time student in a second class citizen category. Realistically, a funding mechanism must be devised that will eliminate that type of discrimination.

Dr. Harold Colburn, a Burlington County Freeholder, also objected to the current funding arrangement. Noting that Burlington County College's student population "... is made up increasingly of older age students," Dr. Colburn said:

We do question whether the county can afford to subsidize a disproportionate share of older students when we understand that the amount of state support is less for part-time students than for full-time students. . . . We feel that the state should support the part-time student at the same rate per hour of instruction as it does full-time students.

Financial Aid for Non-Traditional Students

Mrs. Helen E. Marshall spoke to the Commission as a representative of the Student Government Association of Essex County College. She stated her concern over the fact that many non-traditional students are frequently ineligible for financial aid because they take less than a full credit load (12 credits); they work full-time and their incomes are too high; or they have built up equity in their homes or have other assets which disqualify them. Mrs. Marshall is concerned that the present financial aid system does not take into account the special circumstances of non-traditional students.

Dr. Gordon Van de Water, Director of the Office of Special Programs in the Department of Higher Education, raised two policy questions concerning financial aid for the Commission's consideration:

The first area is the setting of priorities for extension of student assistance programs to full-time higher income students, part-time students, and possibly, proprietary school students. And, within the part-time student question, which types of part-time students should be aided first, half-time and better only, degree credit students only, etc.

The second policy question is the establishment of a set of principles which relate tuition level to state subsidy and student aid. Whatever you decide to recommend about state subsidy level and tuition levels will have a significant impact on future directions of state student assistance programs and I would ask you to consider those impacts and make recommendations in those areas also.

INDIVIDUALS PRESENTING STATEMENTS TO THE COMMISSION

Mr. George Albanese
Union County Manager

Dr. William L. Apetz
President
Gloucester County College

Mr. James Auerbach
President
New Jersey State Federation of
Teachers, AFT

Dr. Theodore Austin
Nursing Program Coordinator
Union College

Mr. Leslie Balter
Vice President
Private Career School Association of
New Jersey

Mr. Paul J. Barotta
Union County Technical Institute

Mr. Robert Bocchino
President
Devry Technical Institute

Ms. Leanna Brown
Morris County Freeholder

Dr. William E. Bryan
President
Salem Community College

Dr. Fred G. Burke
Commissioner
New Jersey Department of Education

Dr. George Charen
Dean of Instruction
Bergen Community College

Mr. Richard D. Chumney
Director, Division of Rural Resources
New Jersey Department of Agriculture

Dr. Elric A. Cicchetti
Superintendent
Mercer County Vocational/Technical
Schools

Dr. Harold L. Colburn
Burlington County Freeholder

Mr. Neil Dehaan
CETA Prime Sponsor
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Dr. David W. D. Dickson
President
Montclair State College

Mr. Ira H. Dorfman
Administrator, Office of Conservation
New Jersey Department of Energy

Mr. Sidney J. Dubroff
President
Lyons Institute

Ms. Kathy Earley
Middlesex County College

Senator John Ewing
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
New Jersey Senate

Dr. Joseph R. Fink
President
Somerset County College

Ms. Charlee Frantino
Essex County College

Mr. Louis Genovese
Controller
Essex County College

Mr. Robert L. Goudie
Dean of Administration
Atlantic Community College

Mr. John Hanley
President
Mercer County Community College

Dr. George Harris
President
Essex County College

Dr. Maurice P. Hartley
President
New Jersey Cooperative Education
Consortium

Mr. John J. Horn
Commissioner
New Jersey Department of Labor
and Industry

Mr. William Huber
President
Association of New Jersey Community
College Continuing Education and
Community Service Directors

Mr. Edison Jackson
Vice President, Student Affairs
Essex County College

Ms. Sandra L. Jackson
County College of Morris

Mr. Richard H. Jones
Associate Dean Student Services
Gloucester County College

Mr. Richard P. Kamenitzer
Dean of Business Affairs
Passaic County Community College

Mrs. Lillian R. Kerzner
President
Private Career School Association of
New Jersey

Mr. Brian Lewis
Burlington County College

Mr. Carmine Loffredo
Associate Dean
Essex County College

Dr. William Lutz
Director, Basic Skills Council
Department of Higher Education

Mr. Miles MacMahon
Essex County College

Mrs. Helen E. Marshall
Student Government Association
Essex County College

Dr. Sherman H. Masten
President
County College of Morris

Dr. Otto R. Mauke
President
Camden County College

Mrs. Kathleen McLaughlin
Sussex County College Study Commission

Dr. Gustavo Mellander
President
Passaic County Community College

Mr. Guy E. Millard
County Administrator
Somerset County

Dr. Florence Mintz
Curriculum Specialist,
Curriculum Laboratory
Rutgers, The State University

Mr. Peter Mora
Chairperson, Department of
Developmental Studies
Atlantic Community College

Mr. J. Harrison Morson
Dean of Student Affairs
Union College

Mr. Wilmot F. Oliver
Dean of Instruction, Ocean County College

Dr. Saul Orkin
President
Union College

Ms. Carol A. Pagano
Coordinator of Financial Aid,
Career Counseling and Placement
Bergen Community College

Dr. Nathaniel Pallone
Associate Vice President,
Adult and Continuing Education
Rutgers, The State University

Mr. Richard Pearson
Board of Trustees
Thomas A. Edison College

Mr. Bernard G. Peltz
Dean for Academic Affairs
Salem Community College

Mr. Malcolm P. Pennypacker
Board of Trustees
Burlington County College

Ms. Dorothy K. Power
Middlesex County Freeholder

Mr. E.J.J. Power
Bell Laboratories
Murray Hill, New Jersey

Mr. Theodore K. Rabb
Director, Mid-Career Fellowship Program
Princeton University

Dr. Alban E. Reid
President
Bergen Community College

Mr. Peter Rosamilia
Vice Chairperson
N.J. Advisory Council for Adult,
Continuing and Community Education

Mr. Charles A. Rosen
Chairman
N.J. Advisory Council on
Vocational Education

Mr. William Rynone, Jr.
Coordinator
Electronic Technology Program,
Union County Technical Institute

Mr. Joseph A. Schlegel
New Jersey Prime Sponsor
Directors Association

Mr. Joseph Scott
Vice President
Hudson County Community
College Commission

Mr. Gary Simmerman
Cumberland County Freeholder

Dr. Donald H. Smith
President
Brookdale Community College

Ms. Pamela K. Sorrells
Associated Students of Burlington
County College

Dr. Robert Spellman
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Essex County College

Mr. Donald L. Suppers
Dean for Academic Affairs
Mercer County Community College

Mr. Arthur R. Sypek, Jr.
County Executive, Mercer County

Mr. John Tinnesz
Private Career School Association of
New Jersey

Ms. Charlee Trantino
Essex County College

Mr. David H. Tyrrell
Dean, Division of Engineering Technologies
Middlesex County College

Dr. Dennis Valenti
Director, Senior Citizen Institute
Essex County College

Dr. Gordon Van de Water
Director, Office of Special Programs
Department of Higher Education

Mr. Jerry Veldof
New Jersey Education Association

Ms. Anita E. Voorhees
Director, Division of Community Services
and Special Projects
Middlesex County College

Mr. William Walsh
Board of Trustees
Middlesex County College

Mr. Richard C. Wenner
N.J. Prime Sponsor Directors Association

Dr. Lawrence R. Winchell, Jr.
President
Atlantic Community College

Mr. Kenneth Wright
Dean of the College
Passaic County Community College